Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-198
Monday
16 October 1989

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-198 *16 October 1989*

CONTENTS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Chernyshev Views Cheney Demand for SDI Allocations *[TASS]* 1
FRG's Von Weizsaecker Speaks at Forum on Arms Cuts *[TASS]* 1
Kashlev Discusses Conventional Arms Cuts *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 40]* 2

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

More on General Lobov Address at NATO Session 4
Lobov Interviewed on Proceedings *[Moscow International]* 4
Session Reviewed, Results Noted *[PRAVDA 11 Oct]* 4
Moscow CEMA-EEC Meeting Focuses on Cooperation 5
Conference Opens *[Moscow Radio]* 5
Sychev Addreses Conference *[TASS]* 5
Conference Concludes *[TASS]* 6
UNCTAD Session Closes, Adopts Declarations *[TASS]* 6
International Conference Opens in Rimini *[TASS]* 7

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

U.S. Navy Chief of Operations Ends USSR Visit *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 15 Oct]* 8
Yazov Receives Trost *[TASS]* 8
Bessmertnykh Interviewed on U.S. Relations *[Moscow TV]* 8
Shevardnadze's U.S. Visit Marks 'New Era' *[Pastukhov in SELSKAYA ZHIZN 7 Oct]* 10
Journalists' Delegation Received by James Baker *[PRAVDA 15 Oct]* 12

Near East & South Asia

Gerasimov Says Syrian MiG Incident 'Upsetting' *[Kuwait KUNA]* 12
Commentary on Pilot's Defection *[Zlatorunskiy on Moscow International]* 12
Afghan General Discusses Upcoming Rebel Offensive *[TASS]* 13
Najibullah on Muslim Mediation in Peace Talks *[PRAVDA 12 Oct]* 13
Aghan Military, Political Developments Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 13 Oct]* 14
Afghan Statement on Military Aid Cited *[TASS]* 14
Afghan Foreign Minister Discusses Peace Efforts *[PRAVDA 15 Oct]* 15
Updated Report on Afghan Military Situation *[PRAVDA 13 Oct]* 16
Iraqi Ambassador Hasayn Presents Credentials *[TASS]* 16
Continued U.S. Presence in Gulf Criticized *[Andreyev on Moscow International]* 17

East Europe

GDR's Honecker Urges 'Open Dialogue' on Problems *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 15 Oct]* 17
GDR Politburo Statement on Refugee Exodus Cited *[PRAVDA 13 Oct]* 18
Levin on Statement, Mass Exodus *[Moscow Radio]* 18
Further Reaction to Statement *[Moscow Radio]* 19
ADN Cites GDR Organizations' Calls for Reforms *[TASS]* 20
GDR's Hager Attends Culture Festival in USSR 20
Opening Cermonies Reported *[PRAVDA 14 Oct]* 20
Medvedev, Hager Sign Cultural Program *[East Berlin ADN]* 21
Hager Ends Visit, Departs *[Moscow Radio]* 21
Shevardnadze-Fischer Exchange of Messages Cited *[PRAVDA 15 Oct]* 21
Medvedev Meets GDR Academy of Sciences President *[PRAVDA 12 Oct]* 22

Hungarian Socialist Party Congress Ends ... 22
Results Noted *[Moscow TV]* ... 22
Nyers Describes Work of Congress *[TASS]* ... 22
Hungary's Grosz Cited on Party Split *[Moscow TV]* ... 23
PRAVDA Cites Hungarian Socialist Party Appeal *[12 Oct]* ... 23
Hungarian Party's Organizational Tasks Noted *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 13 Oct]* ... 24
Zaykov Arrives in Prague for Moscow Days Fesitval *[TASS]* ... 24
Zaykov on Moscow Days in Prague *[Moscow TV]* ... 24
PRAVDA Cites Jakes Report to CPCZ Plenum *[13 Oct]* ... 24
Further on Jakes Report to Plenum *[PRAVDA 13 Oct]* ... 25
CPCZ Aide on Bloc Influence on Reform Pressure *[IZVESITYA 15 Oct]* ... 25
Moiseyev Attends Czechoslovak Embassy Reception *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 7 Oct]* ... 26
Polish Government's Economic Program Viewed *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 13 Oct]* ... 26
Yakovlev Meets With Romania's Stoian 10 Oct *[PRAVDA 11 Oct]* ... 27
Romania's Party Recruitment Drive Reported *[PRAVDA 11 Oct]* ... 27
Economic Cooperation With Romania Analyzed *[IZVESTIYA 3 Oct]* ... 28

West Europe

Katushev Talks in Italy Anticipate Gorbachev Visit *[TASS]* ... 29
Italian Delegation Visits Moscow *[TASS]* ... 30
Military Observers Arrive for Turkish Exercise *[TASS]* ... 30
Finnish Commander in Chief Pays Working Visit ... 30
Yazov Meets With Valtanen *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 Oct]* ... 30
Valtanen Meets With General Staff *[TASS]* ... 30
Valtanen Departs; Moiseyev Comments *[TASS]* ... 30
Soviet-Norwegian Cooperation Commission Meets *[PRAVDA 12 Oct]* ... 31
FRG Naval Detachment Arrives on Friendly Visit ... 31
FRG Defense Minister Comments *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 Oct]* ... 31
Ships in Leningrad for First Visit *[DPA]* ... 32
Visit To 'Lay Ground' for Contacts *[TASS]* ... 32

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet Session

Latvian Leaders Comment on Session *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 27 Sep]* ... 33
Paper Reports Strike Law Debates *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 11 Oct]* ... 33
Commission Examines Health Care Provision *[PRAVDA 10 Oct]* ... 35
Poll Sees Supreme Soviet as 'More Businesslike' *[TASS]* ... 36
Commissions Discuss Election Process 11 Oct *[TASS]* ... 36
Commission Recommends More Funds for Railroads *[TASS]* ... 37
Legislation Committee Prepares Draft Ownership Law *[TASS]* ... 37
Commissions Discuss Cooperatives, Ownership 13 Oct *[Moscow Radio]* ... 38
Further on Cooperatives Discussion *[TASS]* ... 39
Deputies Discuss Law on Socialist Enterprise *[TASS]* ... 39
Accusations Against Gdlyan Remain Unproven *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 13 Oct]* ... 39
Sakharov, Others Fault System for Economic Ills *[Moscow International]* ... 40
Supreme Soviet Joint Session Resumes 16 Oct *[Moscow Radio]* ... 40
Lukyanov Chairs Meeting *[Moscow Radio]* ... 40

Political & Social

Paper Reports Gorbachev Meeting With Media Chiefs *[PRAVDA 14 Oct]* ... 40
Kryuchkov Interviewed on Role of State Security *[Moscow International* ... 41
Thousands Attend Rallies in Moscow, Kiev, Tashkent ... 41
Yeltsin Addresses Moscow Crowd *[Vienna ORF Teletext]* ... 41
Yeltsin Publication Sells Out Maiden Issue *[Belgrade TANJUG]* ... 41
Deputy Obolenskiy Says Yeltsin 'Ill' *[Moscow Radio]* ... 41
To Resume Work After Recovering From 'Chill' *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 15 Oct]* ... 42
Vorotnikov Chairs Draft Law Discussion *[TASS]* ... 42

Politburo Examines Leadership Visits *[TASS]* 42
Ryzhkov Cites Goods Problems on New Program *[Moscow TV]* 43
Flaws in Current Reform Process Analyzed *[PRAVDA 12 Oct]* 44
Law Regulating Labor Disputes Published *[PRAVDA 14 Oct]* 47
Armenian Supreme Soviet Plans 15, 21 Oct Sessions *[Yerevan Radio]* 49
Supreme Soviet To Meet 21 Oct *[Yerevan Radio]* 49
Parliament Convenes 15 Oct *[Yerevan International]* 49
Yerevan Receives Fuel, Construction Materials *[Yerevan International]* 49
Leaders Thank Georgians for Assistance *[KHORHRDAYIN HAYASTAN 13 Oct]* 50
Konarev Outlines Rail Traffic Problems *[IZVESTIYA 15 Oct]* 50
Azerbaijani, Armenian Law Enforcement Organs Meet *[IZVESTIYA 15 Oct]* 50
Proposals Made for Armenian Economic Independence *[Yerevan Radio]* 50
Moldavian Working People's Union Holds Congress *[TASS]* 51
Ukraine Officials End Discussion on Language Law *[TASS]* 51
Demonstration for Uniate Church in Lvov Reported
[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 19 Sep] 52
Lvov Mayor Interviewed on Informals' Actions *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 15 Oct]* 52
People's Deputy Wants Crimean AES Stopped *[PRAVDA UKRAINY 15 Sep]* 54
Protest at Building of Tatar AES Gains Support *[Moscow Radio]* 55
Orchestrated Pro-Nuclear Campaign Challenged *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 5 Oct]* 55
Lithuanian Communist Party Plenum Ends 13 Oct *[Vilnius International]* 56
Party Congress Scheduled for 19 Dec *[Moscow Radio]* 57
Lithuanian Party's Leadership Style Criticized *[PRAVDA 6 Oct]* 57
Human Rights Action Group Set Up in Lithuania *[Vilnius International]* 59
Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Statement on Situation *[SOVETSKAYA LITVA 26 Sep]* 59
Akhromeyev Attends Riga Liberation Day Fete *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 Oct]* 60
Latvia's Vagris Answers Voters' Questions *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 24 Sep]* 60
Khrushchev Ouster, Gorbachev Prospects Assessed *[Moscow International]* 61
AUCCTU Chairman Salayev Interviewed *[Prague PRACE 10 Oct]* 63
Sep Plenum Discussion Reviewed *[Moscow TV]* 65
Kemerovo Official Speech Reported *[TRUD 6 Sep]* 67
Aircraft Crashes 'Recently' in Chernigov Oblast *[IZVESTIYA 5 Oct]* 69
Children Contract AIDS in Stavropol Hospital *[IZVESTIYA 16 Oct]* 70
Problems Discussed at Inaugural AIDS Conference
[SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH 21 Sep] 70
Infant Mortality Rates Cited *[Moscow TV]* 71
Report on Rising Crime Rate in USSR Viewed *[Moscow TV]* 71
Soviet Air Traffic Control Organ Needed *[PRAVDA 30 Sep]* 72
Militia Drills in Minsk Area Remain Unexplained *[SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA 19 Sep]* 73
Officials Rapped Over Treatment of Veterans *[IZVESTIYA 17 Sep]* 73
People Should Not 'Irresponsibly Denigrate' KGB *[PRAVDA 7 Oct]* 75
Railways Minister Withdraws Suit Against Deputy *[PRAVDA 12 Oct]* 76
Through Traffic on BAM Route Noted *[Moscow Radio]* 76
People's Deputies Answer Students' Questions *[Moscow TV]* 76
Doubts Voiced About Economic Accountability *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 13 Sep]* 81
Magazines' Editors Answer Readers' Questions *[Moscow TV]* 83
Youth Paper To Be Published in Irkutsk *[Moscow Radio]* 88
New 'Press Bulletin' Published in Dushanbe *[Moscow Radio]* 88
Plane Using 'Alternative Fuel' To Fly to France *[Moscow International]* 88
Cheap Night Electricity for Heating Rural Homes *[IZVESTIYA 2 Oct]* 88

Economic

Ryzhkov Notes 'Complex' Economic Situation *[Moscow TV]* 89
Abalkin Interviewed on Economic Recovery *[Moscow TV]* 95
Abalkin Cites Anti-Inflation Measures in 1990 Plan *[TASS]* 98
Reasons for Low Return on Capital Analyzed *[Rytov in IZVESTIYA 10 Oct]* 99
Economic Experiment Set for Sverdlovsk Oblast *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 10 Oct]* 100

Scientific

Activities of 'Mir' Cosmonauts Updated 100
Complete 5th Week in Space *[Moscow Radio]* 100
Correct Flight Trajectory *[TASS]* 100
Visual Observations, Photos Planned *[Moscow Radio]* 101
More Tests Planned; Flight Going Well *[Moscow Radio]* 101
Safety of Semipalatinsk Test Ground Analyzed *[Moscow TV]* 101
Dangers of Tatar AES Construction Explained *[Moscow Radio]* 103
Ukraine Research Adds to Galaxy Knowledge *[TASS]* 104

Military

Bomber, Transport Collide in Caucasus; Six Killed *[IZVESTIYA 16 Oct]* 104
Moiseyev Cites Importance of Naval Dialogue *[TASS]* 105
Government Announces Carrier Rocket Test Launches *[TASS]* 105
Food Production for Soviet Army Discussed *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 40]* 105

Chernyshev Views Cheney Demand for SDI Allocations

LD1310153289 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1248 GMT 13 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow, 13 Oct [dateline incomplete as received]—Vladimir Chernyshev, TASS commentator on military issues, writes:

U.S. Defense Secretary Richard Cheney has stated that the curtailment by Congress of the administration's demand for allocations for the SDI program threatens to frustrate its implementation. He added that he intends to recommend that the President veto the bill if the resources allocated in it are insufficient for implementing the program.

Such a statement, in our opinion, is calculated primarily to "appease" the conservative circles of Republicans who are alarmed by the success of the talks in Wyoming. The Pentagon chief also is sending a signal to the military-industrial complex on the whole, by demonstrating the adherence of the present administration to the program of creating an antimissile defense system with regard to making use of space. The readiness expressed by the Soviet side to sign and ratify a treaty on the 50-percent reduction of strategic offensive arms even if no agreement is reached on the problem of antimissile defense and space weapons by the completion of its elaboration has "frightened" somebody in the United States too much.

In these conditions, it is reasonable to ask why huge financial resources are spent on the development of SDI when the opportunity for the mutual, and moreover, considerable Soviet and U.S. reduction of strategic nuclear missile arsenals is patently obvious? Moreover, Americans' belief in the naive and unsubstantiated Reaganite "dream" of the "complete defense" of the United States with the help of a "space umbrella" has long since vanished into thin air. However, the administration of George Bush, realistically evaluating the difficulties of a scientific and technical nature, no longer affirms that the SDI will give hope for the creation of an absolutely reliable shield against a missile strike.

Yes, and now it would be possible to convince the U.S. public of the very possibility of a "Strike," since the "enemy image" of the Soviet Union has faded in the eyes of the Americans. Public opinion polls in the United States show that taxpayers manifestly prefer a mutual reduction in Soviet and U.S. weapons arsenals to "Star Wars."

I would like to speak of one other factor. The U.S. Administration quite often makes declarations about the possibility of using SDI as a factor for pressuring the Russians in the arms control sphere, but surely this "card" is no longer in play, either. It should be acknowledged that after Reagan's announcement of the "Strategic Defense Initiative" we, at first, also yielded to the publicity stunts of the "star warriors," and exaggerated the possibility of the future ABM system. This is now behind us, as well. In the USSR, the potential possibilities of the program and the "threats" it will bring are clearly conceived. We also have an idea about how to neutralize its influence on strategic parity with significantly less spending.

The Soviet Union now does not object to research work being done in the United States within the framework of SDI, allowing for research and tests connected with it to be done not only in laboratories, but even in space, as well. However, this should not relate to the ABM components and systems and to their space based prototypes. Precisely for this reason the USSR is insisting that the sides' obligations to observe the ABM Treaty be recorded in the treaty on the 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive weapons, in addition to a clause on the right to depart from the strategic offensive weapons treaty if one of the sides does not observe the ABM Treaty.

What will the United States gain by the accelerated continuation of work on the SDI program, for which the Pentagon chief is fighting so strongly? If SDI is created, the United States will gain a hypothetical defense system against an equally hypothetical threat, and simultaneously, the threat of the USSR departing from a future strategic offensive weapons treaty will arise. So does Mr Cheney need a strategic offensive weapons treaty, or does he prefer the creation—as soon as possible—of SDI and an increase in nuclear arsenals?

FRG's Von Weizsaecker Speaks at Forum on Arms Cuts

LD1410194989 Moscow TASS in English 1934 GMT 14 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 14 TASS—By TASS diplomatic correspondent:

Soviet diplomatic circles are gratified to note the fact that an increasing number of state and political figures of the West, overcoming the stereotypes of the past, are beginning to look at the events taking place in the world as a whole and in socialist countries in particular from the positions of new political thinking and realism. President Richard von Weizsaecker of the Federal Republic of Germany, addressing the participants in an international symposium dealing with the problem of conventional arms cuts in Central Europe at the Munich higher school of the Bundeswehr on Friday, said that a continuation of the relaxation of tension between East and West is inconceivable without determination to carry on disarmament talks.

This, in its turn, should be supplemented by measures of large-scale cooperation in all fields.

In the opinion of the FRG's president, wide opportunities in this respect are being opened up by processes taking place in socialist countries.

"The West" Weizsaecker emphasised in this connection, "should more actively use the chance of broadening cooperation with those countries."

The Federal president's remarks are imbued with the understanding of European realities and of the importance of developing all-European cooperation for the benefit of all countries of the continent.

However, in the West as a whole and among representatives of West Germany in particular, there still are figures to whom East-West relations remain a sphere of search for one-sided advantages and benefits.

Yet another example of such approach was provided by a speech made by Manfred Woerner, NATO secretary-general and former defence minister of the FRG, at the session of the North Atlantic Assembly in Rome.

He rejected out of hand the idea of building a "Common European Home," stating that it is fully unacceptable.

The NATO secretary-general visualizes the future of Europe in a peculiar way. "Entirely on our terms," he stated. "Our values and ideals hold the key to the economic and political future of the Soviet Union and its allies. This is a reality with which the communist leaders must reckon."

No wonder that, in order to corroborate such "ideological position," Woerner came forward with the thesis about unilateral disarmament of Warsaw Pact member states.

It is noteworthy, however, that the speech did not arouse full approval by those present at the session, as previously used to be the case.

The work of the Rome session confirmed that in NATO circles there is growing awareness of what the federal president spoke in Munich.

It was not fortuitous that for the first time in the history of the North Atlantic bloc, a session of its assembly was attended by Soviet General Vladimir Lobov, chief of staff of the Joint Armed Forces of the Warsaw Pact.

Thereby a direct dialogue between the military leaders of the two blocs was started.

Against the background of these events, Woerner's remarks sounded as an appeal to the past, not the future.

Kashlev Discusses Conventional Arms Cuts

90UI0014A Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 40 7-13 Oct 89 p 4

[Report on interview with Yu.B. Kashlev, USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs ambassador at large, by Yu. Sigov: "Less Weapons, More Human Rights; Warsaw Pact and NATO Armies Number More Than 10 Million Men"; date and occasion not specified]

[Text] The All-European meeting in Vienna was marked by a breakthrough in the reduction of troops and conventional weapons and safeguarding human rights and humanitarian cooperation. Ambassador-at-Large Yu.B. Kashlev of the USSR MFA [Ministry of Foreign Affairs] recounts how decisions of the Vienna meeting on security and cooperation are implemented.

[Sigov] As is well-known, the Soviet Union is reducing its armed forces unilaterally. However, somehow nothing is heard about the reduction of armies of the NATO countries. Doesn't our "military tractability" infringe on the security of the USSR?

[Kashlev] Today, both military blocs in Europe—the Warsaw Pact and NATO—are obviously rearmed. In so doing, tremendous resources are expended not only on strategic nuclear weapons, but on conventional weapons as well. More than two-thirds of all military expenditures of the European states are spent on them. Armies of the WP [Warsaw Pact] and NATO countries number more than 10 million men. But the conduct of a "conventional" war in Europe is absurd in itself—today the continent is literally larded with AES [nuclear electronic power station] and other nuclear facilities that a hit by a conventional artillery shell could blow up and cause a catastrophe.

As for our unilateral disarmament, it does not carry a threat to the security of the USSR. We hope that a reduction in the Soviet military presence in the WP countries must lead to a reduction of American and other forces in the FRG. Up to the present time, many for some reason believe that the withdrawal of Soviet military subunits from Hungary, the GDR [German Democratic Republic], Czechslovakia, and Poland almost inevitably will result in an "invasion" by troops of the armies of the NATO countries into the territories of these socialist countries. The absurdity of such fears is more than obvious.

[Sigov] Nevertheless, as previously, there is fear in the West of a Soviet military threat. So, is there any sense in disarming even further, if they do not believe us?

[Kashlev] Both military blocs in Europe have different structures of armed forces by virtue of historical conditions. The WP has tens of thousands more tanks, and NATO has a significant advantage in tactical aviation. The Soviet Union proposes to NATO members to reduce tank and artillery subunits, armored vehicles, strike aircraft, helicopters, and personnel.

[Sigov] And from the point of view of measures of trust, how should the presence of Soviet submarines on Norway's shores be viewed? Because, according to data of the Ministry of Defense of that country, about 200 of them ply the waters there....

[Kashlev] I do not know where that figure came from. The following balance of naval forces now exists on the seas: NATO has about a five-fold superiority in large surface ships (aircraft carriers, cruisers), and we have a

slight advantage in submarines. One can understand the alarm of the Norwegians with respect to our naval presence at its shores, but the question about naval reductions is being blocked by the NATO countries themselves who do not want to lose their advantage. We are ready on our part to reduce the number of submarines, if corresponding reductions will be made in the navies of the NATO states. However, for the time being they even refuse to talk about this.

[Sigov] Let us now turn to the question of human rights. They still do not believe in the West in the sincerity of USSR intentions, with the justification that in our country "all of those who want to" cannot leave the country to go abroad....

[Kashlev] This is not quite so—more and more people in the West are beginning to believe us. After the Congress of People's Deputies, the Soviet Union received a singular "credit of trust" for implementing its reforms. But the West, of course, cannot dictate to us the speed of their implementation. At the same time, they expect not simply phrases about the liberalization of procedures, but the laws themselves that could officially affirm the right of a person to leave his country and to return to it freely.

Yes, for the time being "not all who desire" can leave the country to go abroad for permanent residency. Of 1,800 persons who could not leave in January of this year principally for reasons of knowledge of state secrets, 1,512 such persons have received permission. If the reasons for postponement of a departure from the USSR do not satisfy people, they have a right to go to court.

[Sigov] But still, after proclaiming the right of Soviet citizens to free exit, at the same time insurmountable economic obstacles are created for this—there are no air tickets, there is no hard currency for exchange, etc.

[Kashlev] The right to free departure from the country and return to it depends on many factors. It is necessary to consider in this that recently the number of Soviet citizens going abroad for permanent residency increased sharply. While in 1985 there were 4,500 persons, in 1988 there were 108,000, and just in the past months of 1989, this figure has been exceeded considerably. That is why difficulties arise with currency exchange, tickets, etc.

[Sigov] And how do you explain the fact that the further the process of democratization moves ahead, the more Soviet citizens are trying to go abroad?

[Kashlev] Let us look at who now constitutes the main mass of emigrants—it is Armenians, Germans, and Jews, who in a search for a better life decide to go to their own, frequently very distant relatives abroad. It must be realized that for many years these people were not allowed to leave: Numerous such cases piled up, and, therefore, UVIR [Visa and Foreigner Registration Office] now has to deal with a real "emigration flow." Of course, there is the effect of such factors as the earthquake in Armenia, events in Nagorno-Karabakh, and the lack of autonomy for the Soviet Germans. But all of these problems will be resolved; and I do not think that the emigration flow will be endless. For such an enormous country like the USSR, the figures on those departing is still insignificant on the whole. But, in general, I believe that there is nothing reprehensible in the fact that people want to leave the Soviet Union and live abroad. On the contrary, the freedom of departure fits completely within the scope of the philosophy of humane and democratic socialism.

[Sigov] Besides the area of human rights where the Soviet Union is just winning the trust of its partners in negotiations, serious concern in the West is raised by our position on problems of ecology....

[Kashlev] Actually, for many years we not only closed our eyes to critical ecological problems in our country, but we even criticized Western companies for polluting the environment. It has now become apparent that about 20 percent of the world's pollution in some ecological categories comes from Soviet enterprises. Considering that we all live on one planet, ecological problems are no longer national—they have assumed a global character.

[Sigov] Does it not seem to you that all of the aspects of the all-European process that were touched upon—disarmament, human rights, and ecology—deserve a lot of attention on the part of the USSR Supreme Soviet?

[Kashlev] The USSR MFA is actively in favor of the Supreme Soviet, its commissions, and its committees getting more energetically involved in and monitoring the implementation of the Vienna agreements. This will also help our internal perestroyka and the foreign policy activity of the USSR.

More on General Lobov Address at NATO Session

Lobov Interviewed on Proceedings

LD1310103589 Moscow World Service in English 0910 GMT 13 Oct 89

[Text] At the 35th recent annual session of the NATO interparliamentary body, the North Atlantic Assembly in Rome, there was a participant from the Soviet Union for the first time, the chief of staff of the joint armed forces of the Warsaw Treaty organization, Army General Vladimir Lobov. Back in Moscow he was questioned by our reporter. Here is his story:

General Lobov has told the reporter that his main topic in Rome was perestroyka in the Soviet society and in the Soviet Army. He cited concrete examples of the defensive essence of the military doctrine of the Warsaw Treaty organization. For one, General Lobov said that in keeping with the unilateral pledges, three armored divisions have already been pulled out from the territory of our Warsaw Treaty allies. About 50 percent of the combat vehicles intended for destruction have been scrapped. By the end of the year, 500 nuclear charges will have also been withdrawn. According to General Lobov all these facts were of great interest to his audience, the members of parliament of NATO countries who are members of the North Atlantic Assembly.

I felt good will and keen interest, said General Lobov. Many members of the assembly spoke to me about their support for perestroyka, but there were others who did not have such sentiments. The assembly itself did not support these critics and so there was no confrontation at it, noted General Lobov. Both in a heated exchange with the supreme commander of the NATO forces, U.S. General John Galvin, and in discussions with members of parliament from NATO countries, perestroyka could be seen in that no one was forced to give up his views. At the same time, all tried to look together for mutually acceptable decisions. In that lies the great significance of such meetings.

General Lobov believes that a good foundation has been laid. Contacts should be developed at all levels. Delegations of soldiers must be exchanged. Staff officers are to meet by all means. Contacts of leaders are also of great importance. All this should promote security and stability in Europe and in the rest of the world, said in conclusion the chief of staff of the joint armed forces of the Warsaw Treaty organization, Army General Vladimir Lobov. We may add that a possibility is being studied here to invite the supreme commander of the NATO forces, General John Galvin, to a Warsaw Treaty country.

Session Reviewed, Results Noted

PM1310091089 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Oct 89 Second Edition p 5

[Nikolay Miroshnik dispatch under the rubric "Our Correspondent Comments": "Climate Changing for the Better"]

[Text] Rome—The 35th annual session of the North Atlantic Assembly has ended in Rome. This consultative body, set up within the framework of NATO, today unites some 200 parliamentarians, representing proportionally the legislative body of each of the 16 bloc member countries. The assembly's aim is to promote the development of cooperation and mutual understanding between legislative organs within NATO. In practice, as was recently explained frankly by M. Rumor, deputy chairman of the assembly and head of the Italian delegation, this forum "offers the opportunity to find out in advance the orientation of individual parliaments on a whole range of questions."

Prior to the plenary session, the five main commissions were working for several days: The political and economic commissions, the commission on defense and security, the scientific and technical commission, and the commission on civil affairs, as well as a special committee on NATO strategy and arms control. The attention of numerous observers and correspondents was drawn almost exclusively to the work of the commission on defense and security. Especially since a meeting took place here which has already been described as historic: The parliamentarians were addressed by two generals, who both delivered reports and answered questions: An American and a Soviet general. But whereas NATO Supreme Commander in Europe J. Galvin has long felt at home here, his opponent, Army General V.N. Lobov, chief of staff of the Warsaw Pact Joint Armed Forces, was present at such an event for the first time. True, we should note, to be fair, that he was already acquainted with some members of the assembly both as a military leader and as a member of the USSR Supreme Soviet; last summer a delegation from the assembly visited Moscow for the first time.

It was no accident that I described the two generals as "opponents." Although at times the debate between them in Rome was heated and principled, especially when it came to assessing what the two sides have already done, all the same it was a debate not between adversaries, but between opponents. As the newspapers here noted, in V.N. Lobov's speech the political approach sometimes prevailed over the purely military approach. People here have drawn attention to his words to the effect that the "cold war" is over. Therefore, both NATO and the Warsaw Pact should be abolished as military organizations.

In general this session was devoted to problems of East-West relations. The commission on defense and security unanimously approved the report by K. Voigt, West German deputy from the Social Democratic Party

of Germany, who noted the role of the "new Soviet thinking" in the "unprecedented evolution" of relations between the two sociopolitical systems. The speaker called on the West to assist the policy of reforms and not play on the contradictions that arise on the other side.

As French representative L. Bouvard stressed, delivering a report to the political committee with the frank title "Soviet Foreign Policy Under Gorbachev," the North Atlantic Assembly could in future "play the part of a point of contact with parliamentarians of the Warsaw Pact countries. The purpose of such contacts would be to exchange experience and concrete ideas on the role of legislative organs in defining domestic and foreign policy, including policy in the arms control and disarmament sphere."

But, of course, it would be wrong to note the clear warming of the climate in the North Atlantic Assembly without also mentioning the opposite sentiments, which still exist here. The speech at the plenary session by NATO Secretary General M. Woerner was in general patently in the spirit of past times. He warned the allied states' governments of the impermissibility of "relaxing vigilance" even at a time of sensational improvement in East-West relations. "No allowances can be made when it comes to security," Woerner stated in particular, advocating the modernization of NATO arms regardless of accords on disarmament questions.

All the same, such speeches were in the minority. An indirect answer to them is provided by some words from the speech by Italian Prime Minister G. Andreotti, who called on his listeners to "fear nothing": "Opportunities for peaceful social progress might only arise once, so it is necessary to know how to exploit them to the full in order to achieve permanent changes in East-West relations, making the transition from confrontation to cooperation."

Moscow CEMA-EEC Meeting Focuses on Cooperation

Conference Opens

LD1410095189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0700 GMT 14 Oct 89

[Text] An international conference between CEMA and the EEC opened in Moscow today. At the center of its participants' attention is the issue of the transition to real cooperation as soon as possible. This has been awaiting resolution since the signing of the joint CEMA-EEC declaration in June 1988. It also is proposed to discuss the influence on East-West relations of the processes occurring in connection with the creation of a single European market, the improvement of the mechanism of cooperation within the framework of CEMA, and the economic reforms in the council's separate member countries.

Sychev Addreses Conference

LD1410104889 Moscow TASS in English 0955 GMT 14 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 14 TASS—Prospects and guidelines for the development of economic relationships between the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance and the European Economic Community, the significance of this process for strengthening peace and international security are discussed at an international conference which opened here on Saturday.

The important conference, held in the Soviet Union for the first time, is attended by heads of the CMEA Executive Council and Secretariat, Soviet ministries and departments, representatives of the commissions of the European Community, the European Parliament, some other international organizations, major western firms, Soviet and foreign scholars.

Opening the conference, CMEA Secretary Vyacheslav Sychev noted that the current stage of CMEA-EEC relations is special for both organisations which undergo a period of radical reforms, designed to take them to a qualitatively new stage of integration. However while facing similar problems of integration, the CMEA and EEC are at different stages of this process. This means that the nature and field of their interaction will keep changing with the advance of the reform.

In these conditions a free exchange of views, creative discussion of the most diverse aspects of interaction between the CMEA on the whole and its members countries with the EEC, scientific evaluation and prospects for such interaction will be extremely useful. This is the main task of the conference.

Comparing various points of view will also help elaborate the agreed-upon decisions at official talks between the CMEA and the EEC. There is a great need for this now. More than a year after the signing of the joint declaration in Luxembourg, relations between the two organisations did not advance, while EEC relations with separate CMEA member countries, mainly in trade, are developing considerably faster. In addition to trade, there are a whole number of problems, whose solution is possible only on a multilateral basis—ecology, transport energy, statistics, standardisation, science, technology and economic forecasting, proposed by the CMEA as the possible fields of cooperation.

Lack of progress in CMEA-EEC relations, Sychev said, can be partly explained by the fact that following many years of confrontation, the sides are now cautiously probing each other. "However this does not justify us in the eyes of the European Community, which expects the two organisations to actively engage in cooperation," he stressed.

Conference Concludes

LD1510160189 Moscow TASS in English 1545 GMT 15 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 15 TASS—By TASS correspondent Georgiy Meizerov:

More than 160 representatives from the CMEA [CEMA], Soviet ministries and departments, EEC, Euro-Parliament, large Western firms, and scientists from socialist and capitalist countries attended an international conference on promoting economic cooperation between the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance and the European Economic Community which ended in Moscow today.

The meeting was also attended by delegations from other international organisations and countries outside the CMEA and EEC.

The participants agreed that the meeting achieved what it aimed for, CMEA secretary Vyacheslav Sychev told reporters here today.

A business-like, scientifically substantiated discussion of the state of and prospects for expanding cooperation between the CMEA and EEC on multilateral and Bilateral levels was held.

The meeting discussed issues of common European cooperation and economic relations between East and West.

The participants said that while the cooperation of the EEC with individual CMEA member-countries was expanding, the CMEA and the EEC were marking steps in relations between each other since the signing of the joint declaration on cooperation more than a year ago, according to Sychev.

This is partly explained by the mistrust which the two alliances feel toward each other, but is mostly due to differences in varying powers and authority, he said.

If the EEC can take decisions in foreign trade, the CMEA cannot, at the same time, while the CMEA Executive council has authorised the CMEA Secretariat to conduct talks in such spheres of cooperation as environment, energy, transport, statistics, standardization, science and technology, and economic forecasting, the EEC does not enjoy such a right, Sychev explained.

It looks like the parallel approach toward bilateral and multilateral cooperation on the part of the EEC is not as transparent as has been previously declared, he said.

However, participants in the conference, including members of the European Parliament and Western businessmen, called for a more active cooperation between the CMEA and EEC, Sychev commented, explaining that there is good ground for this.

In mid-November, the CMEA and EEC will start talks on specific proposals for cooperation in environmental protection.

UNCTAD Session Closes, Adopts Declarations

LD1410204889 Moscow TASS in English 2020 GMT 14 Oct 89

[Text] Geneva October 14 TASS—By TASS Correspondent Vladislav Shishlo:

The problems of interdependence of trade, the financing of the development of the international monetary system, and the foreign debts of the developing countries were discussed by the participants in the 36th session of the Trade and Development Board of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD).

The session has come to a close here at the Palace of Nations.

Most speakers at the session, representatives of the developing and socialist countries in particular, emphasised that the lack of cardinal improvement of world economic contacts gives rise to deep concern against the background of visible changes for the better in international political life.

It was also pointed out that the world economic situation remains unsteady, and that contradictions and disbalances in world trade intensify.

The session adopted a number of documents and a declaration on the occasion of the 25th jubilee of the UNCTAD.

The declaration, along with stating that there is economic stagnation in a majority of the developing countries, points out the existence of favourable conditions for strengthening international economic cooperation.

Summing up the session's results, T. Teodorovich, deputy leader of the Soviet delegation, told TASS that the session was quite satisfactory.

A certain contribution was made to the elaboration of an international development strategy for 1990, which is subject to endorsement at next year's U.N. conference on the least developed countries, he said.

The Soviet delegation also considers it important that the Soviet Union's stand, which is oriented towards full-scale participation of our country in the world economy, towards adapting to a new pattern of international division of labour which is now taking shape, including drawing closer to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and international financial organisation, found understanding and support at the session, Teodorovich pointed out.

International Conference Opens in Rimini

LD1510205489 Moscow TASS in English 2035 GMT 15 Oct 89

[Text] Rimini, Italy, October 15 TASS—By TASS correspondent Vladimir Drozhin:

More than 500 state and political figures, scientists and businessmen from Western Europe, the United States, Latin America and Middle East are attending an international conference on current political and economic problems which opened in this Adriatic resort city today.

The Soviet delegation is led by Vadim Zagladin, an aide to President Gorbachev.

Participants in the forum expressed satisfaction over a message of greetings sent by Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev.

Similar messages have also come from U.S. President George Bush, U.N. Secretary General Perez de Cuellar and Italian President Franciesco Cossiga.

Everyone is impressed by changes going on in Eastern Europe, Italian Premier Julio Andreotti told the meeting.

In some countries the reform is deeper, than in others. The irreversibility of the new policy of the Soviet government and its influence on other states can be debated for a long period of time, but one can be said for certain: This process is continuing, and it shall leave no one indifferent.

We shall promote this process to make the change from confrontation to cooperation irreversible.

The Italian prime minister lauded the importance of new Soviet initiatives designed to overcome the rift between North and South. He also welcomed the Soviet intention to cooperate with Western international economic organisations.

State and political figures, scientists, reporters and business representatives were presented awards for their contribution in expanding international economic cooperation.

The conference will last until October 17.

United States & Canada

U.S. Navy Chief of Operations Ends USSR Visit

PM1610095589 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 15 Oct 89 First Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "Departure for Home"]

[Text] Admiral C. Trost, U.S. chief of Naval operations, who has been on an official visit to the USSR at the invitation of the USSR Ministry of Defense, left Moscow 14 October.

During his stay in the Soviet Union Adm C. Trost visited the cities of Sevastopol, Leningrad, Murmansk, and Severomorsk, where he went on board ships of the USSR Navy, addressed students of the Naval Academy and naval school cadets, and familiarized himself with cultural and historical monuments.

On 13 October Adm C. Trost was received by Army General D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister.

On 14 October the U.S. chief of Naval operations was received by Army General M.A. Moiseyev, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff and USSR first deputy defense minister. During the meeting Adm C. Trost expressed gratitude for the opportunity afforded him to visit the Soviet Union. Emphasizing the importance of the talks held with Fleet Admiral V.N. Chernavin, commander in chief of the Navy, he advocated the further broadening of ties between Soviet and U.S. sailors.

The eminent U.S. guest was seen off at Sheremetyevo Airport by Flt Adm V.N. Chernavin, commander in chief of the Navy and USSR deputy defense minister, and by other Soviet admirals and officers.

The send-off party included J. Matlock, U.S. ambassador to the USSR, and Brigadier General G. Govan, defense attache at the U.S. Embassy in the USSR.

Yazov Receives Trost

LD1310150589 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1448 GMT 13 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow, 13 Oct (TASS)—Army General Dmitriy Yazov, USSR minister of defense, today received Admiral Carlisle A. Trost, chief of U.S. Naval operations, who is here on an official visit.

In the conversation that took place, matters of improving Soviet- U.S. relations on the military level were touched upon.

Bessmertnykh Interviewed on U.S. Relations

LD1410204289 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1410 GMT 14 Oct 89

[Interview with Aleksandrovich Bessmertnykh, USSR first deputy minister of foreign affairs, by unidentified correspondent; date not given—live or recorded]

[Text] [Bessmertnykh] To a certain extent, the fifth meeting between our minister, Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze, and Secretary of State Baker was different from the previous ones. It took place at a time when the U.S. Administration was, one might say, completing the process of thrashing out its political concept of relations with the Soviet Union and when we had already begun to experience a certain amount of concern over the fairly slow pace of the talks on security matters, above all on matters relating to nuclear-space weapons. The talks were, therefore, aimed not only at determining each other's stance more precisely and bringing them together, but also at channelling the development of events in the direction of greater interaction. This was the main feature, so to speak, of that round of ministerial meetings.

There are some more aspects I would like to single out: first, the background, the general background to the talks. I am thinking, above all, of the profound processes taking place in our country and throughout the world, and of the U.S. leaders' attitude toward these processes. We are forming the impression that U.S. leadership has started becoming increasingly aware that the perestroyka taking place in the world and in the Soviet Union and its successful development is in the U.S. national interests. Correspondingly, we have sensed a certain degree of readiness or perhaps even a desire to arrive at concrete accords. I should acknowledge right away, of course, that Mikhail Sergeyevich's letter on matters concerning arms limitations and reductions that we handed over to President Bush in Washington—a letter very intensive and rich in content—was a sort of tuning fork for this. So, it was a businesslike and concrete discussion, not an easy one, of course.

One more point: In the past, whenever we began discussing the problem of regional conflicts we would come up against a situation in which sparks began to fly, so to speak, and the discussions were always quite strained. On this occasion the conversations were more pragmatic, with a kind of practical leaning toward seeking a balance of interests—not merely toward seeking but toward determining our own approaches and those of the other side—toward seeking a balance of interests between the Soviet Union and the United States, and, naturally, of those involved in the actual conflicts as well. So on the whole, the discussion was a very broad, businesslike, and concrete one, a predominantly constructive one that ended in the signing and concluding of a range of agreements. We actually had half a dozen of them, with a similar number of possible accords also being prepared. The most important thing was that an understanding was reached on holding the next summit

meeting in late spring or early summer of next year. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev will meet President Bush, and it will be the U.S. turn to play host. Both sides have therefore set themselves quite a lofty objective, which is evidently going to determine our level of diplomatic and political activity over the coming months.

[Correspondent] Many U.S. observers have described the meeting as a qualitatively new stage in Soviet-U.S. relations. In this sense do you feel that the administration is responding to our proposals, or is it proceeding from some pragmatic interest of its own, with the new political thinking not yet having any real effect on U.S policy as a whole?

[Bessmertnykh] I think it is hard to separate one from the other. Any self-respecting government must not only create a vision of things, so to speak, from within government offices, but also attempt to sense the public mood. In this case, regarding the development of ties and relations with the Soviet Union, I think we are seeing a parallel maturing of public opinion and leading circles in the United States, in the sense that they are realizing the importance of further development of Soviet-U.S. relations. It is now I think, becoming axiomatic in the minds of the general public, scientists, journalists [words indistinct] and those in senior government jobs that Soviet-U.S. relations have a special, and I think one could say, unique role to play. There is now a realization that the state of these relations determines international stability and, to a certain extent, domestic stability, and that therefore a crisis in our relations would undoubtedly entail very complicated repercussions for the whole world situation and for the profound processes going on in the Soviet Union, in other countries of the world and indeed in the United States itself. So, without aiming to make any judgment on how far the U.S. Government is catching the public mood, I can say that on matters connected with Soviet-U.S. relations the interests of both now coincide.

As to whether this is a tactical move or a deeply held conviction on the part of the Bush administration, we will see, as they say, but they are displaying concrete efforts to reach accords and a desire for an understanding on major problems.

[Correspondent] Now that the Wyoming meeting is behind us, there have been new meetings here in New York within the framework of bilateral meetings in the UN. How do you personally rate the prospects for Soviet-U.S. relations, particularly since, as you mentioned, preparations are already under way for next year's summit?

[Bessmertnykh] There are two planes; the concrete and the general conceptual. In concrete terms, I think that Soviet-U.S. relations are acquiring a broader field of development and a more solid foundation. I am thinking here of the growing number, the build-up of accords and the established desire to continue working on them. First and foremost, of course, this concerns security issues. I am repeating myself here, but these really do form the essence of Soviet-U.S. relations and distinguish them from our relations with many European and other countries, since here the problems of mutual links in the security sphere are particularly predominant. We have plans for quite a number of possibilities and accords in this respect: First of all, of course, there is the treaty on a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive arms. Our latest proposals and the status of the discussion held indicate that the opportunities are unfolding more widely than in the past, on conventional weapons, on chemicals, on the termination and prohibition of underground nuclear tests and in many spheres of bilateral ties which, incidentally, are playing a major role in developing national economic ties between the two countries, in the fields of economics and trade, environmental contacts and so on. This sort of sphere or, as I call it, safeguard sector of relations has been very much reinforced of late.

As for the broader view, we have already touched on the subject. A more true understanding of the role played by the two countries and their relationship in the world really is reacning fruition. Just how much this understanding is going to express itself in a strategic and stable, as it were, phase of our relations will depend, of course, on the continuing willingness of the two countries' leaders to push relations along in this direction. Nobody is insured against downswings or against the emergence of some uncontrollable circumstances, but I repeat, the role of Soviet- U.S. relations is now such that it requires enhanced attention from the leadership of the two countries. We sense that the U.S. Government, President Bush and Secretary of State Baker realize this. I therefore believe that without eclipsing our relations with other countries, socialist and others, Soviet-U.S. relations will serve as a kind of testing ground for the new thinking in action. For that both sides will have to do a great deal of work.

[Correspondent] This was something mentioned by Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze from the rostrum of the UN General Assembly, where he stressed that the preparations for the meeting and the attainment of new accords would require efforts by both sides at the very highest level. The question of the possibility of concluding a treaty between our countries on a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive arms was also discussed. A number of U.S. observers have drawn attention to the fact that the Soviet Union has decided at this stage not to link this issue to U.S. adherence to the 1972 ABM Treaty in its narrow interpretation. How correct or incorrect are those U.S. observers who believe that the Soviet Union has thereby made a certain concession of the United States?

[Bessmertnykh] I think what you have said is an accurate restatement of the false interpretations of our idea. We have indeed put forward a very important new proposal concerning the prospects for concluding a treaty on a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive arms. This is

something I would emphasize: Our proposal is geared precisely toward opening out that prospect further and making it more real.

So what are we proposing? First, the ABM Treaty, as it was signed in 1972, must be strictly observed. Second, when we consider it possible to engage in research and tests, some specific tests in space related to this research, we exclude from them tests of ABM system and of prototypes of such systems and components of them. Thus, it is simply impossible to carry out in space anything connected with the SDI program.

Finally, third: If it nevertheless happened that one of the sides who have concluded the treaty on a 50-percent reduction of armed forces should violate the ABM Treaty, then the other side acquires the right to withdraw from the treaty on the limitation of strategic offensive arms, the treaty which envisions reduction of arsenals [words indistinct].

Thus, this new position of ours fully guarantees the national interests of the Soviet Union, fully guarantees its security, and at the same time opens very broad possibilities for rapidly moving toward a treaty on a 50-percent reduction of strategic arsenals. I think the U.S. side will take advantage of this, and that at the next round of the Geneva talks we will see more active work on their part.

[Correspondent] Today the subject of Soviet-U.S. relations and of the life of that country and its society is of interest to a great many of us.

[Bessmertnykh] There is certainly enormous interest in the United States, and naturally so. The United States is our main counterpart in the world. Moreover, it is a country which is developing fairly steadily on the whole and has been developing its state and other institutions over the last 200 years, making mistakes, and by trial and error achieved a fairly stable structure of political and state power.

You have to see all that is happening there in a dialectical way. There is a kind of perestroyka going on there, too. A deep process is changing the economic structure, changing the role, the position of the United States in the world economic and financial system. A struggle for world economic leadership is being waged, and the United States is now finding many opponents, competitors, as it were, in this sphere, and they have all kinds of problems. That is actually why one needs an objective perception of that country. I must emphasize that the Americans themselves do not like it very much when we start praising them to excess. I have myself, personally, heard such reactions from Americans, and seen them in the press. They do not like flattery. I understand that currently there is a great discussion going on among us about democracy. Therefore, people are looking to the [words indistinct] of the democratic traditions of the American people. That is very correct, there is much that we can learn from. But, for example, we forget or fail to perceive a detail such as this: that the development of democracy in the United States have been accompanied by quite a great intensification of the legal norms of the individual's behavior and existence within that system. In other words, I would put it like this: the more democratic the country has become, the tougher have been the laws which guard that democracy. It would be important to us also to take this into account. Under a strict regime, say, a dictatorship, it might be possible to do without strict laws, since the regime itself ensures that the appropriate order is maintained in the country. In a democracy, you have to create tougher norms through laws which provide for people's security, from crime, from abuse of all kinds, and so on. I notice that a great many of our publicists, when they speak of the democratic traditions of the United States, for some reason leave out altogether the fact that democracy requires much protection. The more democratic that democracy is, the more serious the laws must be.

Shevardnadze's U.S. Visit Marks 'New Era'

90ui0026A Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 7 Oct 89 p 3

[Article by political observer Nikolay Pastukhov: "USSR-U.S.: A New Era in the Development of Relations"]

[Text] The main landmark for Soviet policy in the field of disarmament is the program to eliminate nuclear and chemical weapons by the end of the 20th century. It can be seen that not all that much time remains. A first step has been taken, namely, the conclusion of the Soviet-U.S. INF Treaty, and talks on reducing strategic offensive arms by 50 percent have been put on the agenda. At the same time talks have started on reducing armed forces and arms in Europe.

In this period the apologists of the old thinking in the West have been pouring criticism down on the concept of a nuclear-free world because, they claim, this is at variance with the philosophy of armed confrontation [silovoye protivoborstvo].

There has been a pause in the development of the negotiating process because a struggle has erupted in the world arena between the new and the old approaches to security. However, under the influence of Moscow the new thinking has been putting down deep roots in the world. As a result many political and state figures in the West have gradually started to reach a consensus that nuclear deterrence is an extremely imperfect and risky guarantee of security in today's world.

New impetus was imparted to the negotiating process by the decision of the USSR and its Warsaw Pact allies to make their doctrine defensive in nature. They have taken unilateral steps in the field of disarmament. These same Warsaw Pact countries have demonstrated their unshakable devotion to real security. In addition to trade, cultural, and economic contacts between the USSR and the West, an important role in confidence-building measures has been played by the development of contacts

along the military line. Conversion in military production is yet another convincing proof of the profound changes in the USSR.

Thus, the successful outcome of the 20 September Washington talks between the USSR foreign minister E.A. Shevardnadze and U.S. President G. Bush and with U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker in Wyoming, was a foregone conclusion. During the course of those talks the entire range of Soviet-U.S. relations was discussed. At talks in the White House E.A. Shevardnadze conveyed to the U.S. President a personal message from M.S. Gorbachev containing new ideas and proposals on the question of preparations for a Soviet-U.S. treaty on strategic offensive arms which made it possible for discussions between the USSR and the United States on the question of strategic offensive arms to be resumed in Geneva. It was agreed in the White House that the next Soviet-U.S. summit meeting should take place in the late spring or early summer of 1990 in the United States.

During the course of the talks in Washington the USSR foreign minister and the U.S. Secretary of State reached important agreements that bring things closer to the conclusion of the long-awaited treaty on 50-percent reductions in strategic offensive arms. The Soviet side proposed new approaches to the strategic arms treaty: not to link conclusion of the treaty with the SDI program, and to eliminate the Krasnoyarsk radar station. In response the American side is promising to review in consultations with its allies the USSR's concern about the United States' and Britain's radar stations in Greenland. Agreement was reached on sea-launched cruise missiles. The Soviet side responded positively to the June initiative of President Bush on verification and stabilization measures. The two sides confirmed the aim of achieving as quickly as possible a comprehensive and truly global ban on chemical weapons that can be subject to verification. Note was made of the work done at the talks on conventional weapons in Europe, and the desire was expressed for conclusion of a treaty as soon as possible. The sides had a thoroughgoing and candid exchange of opinions on regional issues and expressed themselves in favor of political solutions. And finally, the USSR and the United States agreed that a political settlement is essential in Afghanistan on the basis of national conciliation, guaranteeing the status of Afghanistan as a peaceful, independent, and nonaligned state.

When the Soviet-U.S. talks were still under way the 44th session of the UN General Assembly started its work in New York. All the delegates, and the world public, awaited with impatience the speeches at the session by G. Bush and E.A. Shevardnadze.

Dealing with the status of Soviet-U.S. relations in light of the results of the talks in Washington and Wyoming, G. Bush stated the following: "I am very satisfied with the progress we have achieved.... We have reached agreement in principle on various problems, from verification to nuclear testing." The President acknowledged that "serious difficulties still remain, but at the same time both sides are showing the desire to resolve these disagreements constructively and candidly."

E.A. Shevardnadze's speech touched on all aspects of the present-day international situation. He gave great value to the speech by President G. Bush at the session. He said that every people wants to choose freely the path and means of its development. But, E.A. Shevardnadze noted, they must choose responsibly, without locking themselves in the dungeon of national egoism, and ignoring the interests of other peoples and society in general. He devoted a large part of his speech to the threat of nuclear weapons and the need to eliminate them through joint efforts by the peoples. On behalf of the USSR he proposed discussion of this issue at a meeting of representatives of the nuclear powers and also those states on whose territory nuclear weapons are deployed. At that meeting a multilateral agreement could be reached on measures to reduce the danger of the outbreak of nuclear war. He supported the decisions of the Belgrade Conference of the Nonaligned Movement in which the heads of state and government of 102 countries of Asia, Africa, Latin America, and Europe took part. Apart from other matters, these decisions expressed a readiness to create a just economic order in the world. One demonstration of the new Soviet political thinking was the position of the USSR whose essential nature was made known by E.A. Shevardnadze on the subject of events in Poland. He talked about the failure of the Polish Communists in the elections and about the fact that a coalition government has been formed in that country. We, E.A. Shevardnadze noted, have no prejudice against it and we have wished the new Polish Government success and expressed the USSR's readiness to cooperate actively with it. And the Soviet minister emphasized that "tolerance is the norm in civilized political behavior. But if it is obligatory for us in our relations with the present government of Poland, then why are others so intolerant in their relations with, for example, Cuba?"

Characterizing the present status of the Soviet-American dialogue, the journal BUSINESS WEEK, the organ of American business circles, writes: "After the decades when Soviet-American relations were marked by a hostility that was interspersed with bursts of euphoria from summit meetings, now for the first time they have been set on the road of stable, calm cooperation."

A new foreign policy organ has started its work in our country—the USSR Supreme Soviet International Affairs Committee. Its activity during the first session and just opened second session of the Supreme Soviet has already introduced additional elements into the process of the new political thinking.

New hearings recently took place in the committee. They discussed implementation by the Soviet Union of the humanitarian-legal aspect of the agreements reached in January this year at the Vienna meeting of the 35 countries that took part in the Conference on Security

and Cooperation in Europe. The statements in the committee of foreign ministry officials and a number of other departments, and also documents presented by legislators on the whole produced a not bad picture of real movement ahead. Literally just a few days after the signing of the final document of the Vienna meeting, the CPSU Central Committee Politburo recommended to the appropriate ministries and departments that they proceed immediately to implement the agreements and bring our domestic legislation in line with the obligations assumed in Vienna.

The final document from Vienna imposes high standards in the humanitarian-legal sphere. And although the USSR has claims against a whole series of countries in the West with respect to fulfillment of the Vienna agreements, they are watching us with special attention. Not least because the venue chosen to hold the 1991 Conference on the Human Dimensions of the Helsinki process is Moscow.

All these decisions and their rapid implementation will impart additional impetus to the new political thinking both in our country and abroad.

Journalists' Delegation Received by James Baker

PM1610081189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Oct 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Journalists in America"]

[Text] Washington, 14 Oct—U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker received on Friday a delegation of the USSR Journalists Union which arrived here at the invitation of the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

During the conversation which took place, J. Baker noted that Soviet-U.S. relations have entered a dynamic phase, the stage of transition from rivalry and competition to dialogue and cooperation in all spheres. Recalling the latest meetings with USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze, the U.S. secretary of state emphasized the importance of expanding personal contacts between U.S. and Soviet leaders for the strengthening of mutual trust.

The Journalists Union delegation also met with U.S. Vice President D. Quayle; B. Scowcroft, assistant to the President for national security affairs; and T. Foley, speaker of the House of Representatives. After Washington, it will tour the country and will visit Atlanta, Detroit, and New York.

The Soviet delegation includes editors and senior staffers of a number of central, city, and oblast newspapers, the State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting, and representatives of the USSR Journalists Union regional sections.

Near East & South Asia

Gerasimov Says Syrian MiG Incident 'Upsetting'

LD1310113589 Kuwait KUNA in English 1018 GMT 13 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow, Oct 13 (KUNA)—The landing in Israel of a Syrian pilot with a Soviet-built MiG-23 fighter was Friday described by an official Soviet spokesman as "upsetting," in the first Soviet reaction to the controversial incident.

"It's upsetting that airplanes should fly to places other than those [word indistinct] for them" the Foreign Ministry spokesman, Gennadiy Gerasimov told KUNA on the telephone.

The spokesman said he could not estimate the damage the incident might inflict on the Soviet military technology, as he was no military expert. He added that the Defense Ministry may have the answer.

But the Public Relations Department of the Defense Ministry has thus far declined comment on the incident.

A department source, who wished to remain anonymous, told KUNA over the telephone "the Defense Ministry has no comment" on the issue. "You can make your own conclusions," he add.

On Thursday, a Syrian pilot flying a MiG-23 landed in a civilian airstrip in north Israel.

Damascus said the pilot had to make an emergency landing due to a technical problem with the aircraft, while Israel said the airman was seeking political asylum in the Jewish state.

Commentary on Pilot's Defection

LD1310181689 Moscow International Service in Arabic 1500 GMT 13 Oct 89

[Commentary by Aleksey Zlatorunskiy]

[Text] The story of the Syrian pilot who flew from Syria to Israel and landed without any hindrance at a civilian airfield in northern Israel has become an interesting news piece these days. The media are describing details of who this pilot is, what type of plane he was flying, at what altitude he was flying, and so on. These details—which resemble a thriller story surrounding an unusual event—may be interesting but the issue does not lie there. The main issue is that the Mig-23 crossed all the defense lines in the Golan Heights at low altitude and without any hindrance and then penetrated deep into Israeli territory. If we think carefully about what happened we can come up with only one conclusion, namely that no equipment and no electronics can guarantee the safety of state borders, especially in the Middle East where most states occupy small areas. This safety can only be guaranteed through an unshakable peace with neighbors.

Some things are difficult to understand and even more so to explain. Indeed, how can it be possible to understand and explain that Israel obstinately refuses to understand this reality, which should be simple? And why does Israel persist in banking on the arms race and on manufacturing the absolute weapon with which it can threaten the Arabs while itself remaining safe? Huge sums of money are spent for this purpose and an important part of the Israeli industry and sciences is used to increase the military potential. At first, work was carried out to manufacture a nuclear bomb at all costs. Testimonies from many Western media sources suggest that this bomb has been manufactured, although we find it difficult to understand why. Every nuclear explosion in the Middle East—no matter how small—will lead to a catastrophe in the entire region, including Israel.

Now they are manufacturing missiles—and not any missiles, but ballistic missiles which can carry nuclear loads up to a distance of 1,500 kms. Besides everything else, any nuclear state which possesses means of attack becomes a potential target for a retaliatory strike and even for a nuclear strike. So, does Israel not understand this or is it so confident of its safety that it does not even want to think about this issue? The British have a saying: People who live in glass houses should not throw stones.

The incident of the Syrian plane demonstrates that this saying might awaken the Israeli leaders who make their country's policy.

Afghan General Discusses Upcoming Rebel Offensive

LD1310141989 Moscow TASS in English
1325 GMT 13 Oct 89

[Text] Kabul October 13 TASS—By TASS Correspondents Andrey Semyonov and Yuriy Tyssovskiy:

"Joint detachments of the armed Afghan opposition, backed by Pakistan and the United States, are preparing a large-scale offensive on Jalalabad," Lieutenant-General 'Abdul Haq Ulumi, secretary of the Afghan Supreme Defence Council, said at a briefing for foreign newsmen here.

The offensive is to be launched on October 16-18. 'Abdul Haq Ulumi said that according to operational data a meeting was held in this connection in Pakistan. It was attended by rebel leaders Burhanuddin Rabbani (Islamic Society of Afghanistan), Yunis Khalis and Gulbuddin Hikmatyar (two factions of the Islamic Party of Afghanistan), Nabi Muhammadi (Movement for Islamic Revolution), Abd al-Rasul Sayaf (Islamic Union for the Liberation of Afghanistan), and high-ranking Pakistani officers.

The meeting was conducted by the U.S. Ambassador to Pakistan Robert Oakley and special representative of the U.S. President Peter Tomsen. Plans were drawn up for a "lightning" offensive involving 10-15,000 men.

Sixty American military advisers will supervise the organisation of this new blitzkrieg. It is to be supported by missile detachments of the 54th Pakistani Army. Eleven launchers, 60,000 missiles and 4,300 Pakistan servicemen are concentrated for this purpose two and a half kilometers from Towr Kham in Pakistani territory.

'Abdul Haq Ulumi told TASS that large concentrations of rebels, totalling 6,300 men, were spotted in the valleys of the Kabul and Konar Rivers, near the populated localities of Sorkh Rud, Hugiani and Chaparkhar [preceding two placenames as received]. The rebels are not very active so far.

Oakley and Tomsen will have overall control of the new operation. The general stressed that the Afghan Armed Forces were prepared to rebuff this new venture of Pakistan, the United States and the rebels.

The Jalalabad garrison has great combat experience and has recently pushed back its defences considerably—approximately 50- 60 kilometres from the centre of Jalalabad—as a result of a successful offensive on the rebels who have besieged the city for five months. The defenders, Ulumi said, have everything necessary to beat off the planned offensive.

The BAKHTAR news service reports that more than 200 men from different opposition groupings have gone over to the government's side in Balkh Province. Sixty combatants have ceased resistance to government troops in Darzab district of Faryab Province. They expressed readiness to ensure the district's security.

It has been reported here that there have been approximately 300 clashes between different rebel groups during the past two and a half months. They took a toll of about 4,000 rebels killed and almost 2,000 wounded.

The situation has not changed on the approaches to Khowst, Jalalabad and Herat. Afghan army units have put out of action more than 100 rebels.

The Afghan Foreign Ministry has lodged three more notes with the U.N. Good Offices Mission, citing new Pakistani violations of the Geneva Accords.

Najibullah on Muslim Mediation in Peace Talks

PM1310121989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
12 Oct 89 First Edition p 5

[Special correspondent A. Pecherskiy report: "To Put an End to the War"]

[Text] Kabul, 11 Oct—Today is a holiday in Kabul. All Muslims are celebrating the anniversary of the Prophet Muhammad's birth. More than 700 clergy from Afghanistan, India, Pakistan, Syria, Egypt, Bulgaria, and the United States gathered this morning at the "Continental" Hotel for the annual Muslim conference scheduled to coincide with this memorable date.

A greetings message to participants in the meeting from President Najibullah of Afghanistan was read out. It contained an important and fundamentally new proposal for a peaceful settlement in the country—to hold talks between the Afghan Government and representatives of the opposition through the mediation of a Muslim country consenting to act as mediator.

Aghan Military, Political Developments Viewed

PM1310075189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 4

[IZVESTIYA Press Service report: "Afghanistan: Rocket Shelling of Kabul"]

[Text] After a 4-day lull the Afghan armed opposition has resumed rocket shelling of Kabul. According to a report by news agencies, approximately 20 rockets were launched at the city on the eve of the Muslim festival—the Prophet Muhammad's birthday.

According to official data, 36 Kabul residents died and 85 were injured. One rocket exploded at a bus stop where, according to AFP, there were hundreds of people at that moment. Thirty-five of them were killed on the spot. Great damage was caused to vehicles, houses, and administrative buildings.

BAKHTAR has reported that a 300-strong opposition detachment of the organization "the Islamic Union for the Liberation of Afghanistan" has sided with the government in Helmand Province. Fierce clashes are continuing between the mujahidin of G. Hekmatyar's "Islamic Party of Afghanistan" and B. Rabbani's "Islamic Society of Afghanistan." More than 40 people were killed or injured on both sides during fighting in Faryab Province. Armed skirmishes occurred in Balkh Province between supporters of the Islamic Society of Afghanistan and detachments of the "Islamic Revolution Movement of Afghanistan."

A conference devoted to the Prophet Muhammad's birthday has opened in Kabul. Afghan political, public, and religious figures and also guests from a number of countries are participating in it. A message from President Najibullah of Afghanistan was read out at the opening of the conference.

The president emphasized that all Kabul's peace initiatives with regard to settling the Afghan conflict remain in force. He indicated Afghanistan's interest in good relations with Islamic states, particularly with its neighbors. Najibullah stated his government's readiness to accept mediatory efforts with a view to ending the bloodshed and restoring peace on the part of any Islamic country and its consent to holding talks on that country's territory with the opposition without any prior conditions.

On the occasion of the festival President Najibullah signed a decree under which certain categories of prisoners who had been serving a sentence for antigovernment activity have been released.

The Afghan press has carried a "declaration of intent" by the National Salvation Society, which includes many figures from the royal and the Daoud regimes. They are known in the Western press by the name of "technocrats" and are regarded as a "third force" in the confrontation that exists between the two main political trends.

"The flames of war have been raging and blood has been spilled in Afghanistan for more than a decade. Bombs, rockets, shells, and bullets fall on our cities and villages practically daily," the document states. "The worst thing is that today Afghanistan has been turned into a test bed for destructive and lethal weapons. The chief cause of all the misfortunes is that forces alien to us have turned our country into a bridgehead for pursuing their policy and an arena for international confrontation with a view to extending their political and economic influence. They pour oil onto the flames of war every minute by means of false propaganda and by providing the warring sides with weapons and financial assistance."

The declaration points out that the majority of Afghans seek a peaceful life and oppose "any state system, any government imposed on them by force or under the threat of the bayonet, the gun, or the tank."

The National Salvation Society members declared their intention to make contact with all warring Afghan groups, politicians, and organizations based both inside and outside the country with a view to involving them in the search for solutions to vital national problems.

Meanwhile S. Mojadeddi and B. Rabbani, leaders of the opposition "alliance of seven," are paying a visit to the Iranian capital, where they were received by Iranian Foreign Minister 'A.A. Velayati. IRNA reports that the mujahidin leaders expressed gratitude to Iran for its efforts in ensuring unity among the various opposition groupings.

The leaders of the Afghan opposition based in Iran have also met with Velayati and briefed him on their talks with Mojadeddi. Mokhakkek [name as transliterated], spokesman for "the eight," declared that the sides signed a note on mutual understanding which provides for a commission to be set up within the month with a view to drawing up a final agreement. Pointing out that Islam lies at the basis of the principles of unity, Velayati voiced the hope that the Afghan people will soon be living in an Islamic, independent, and nonaligned state.

Afghan Statement on Military Aid Cited

LD1410160989 Moscow TASS in English 1600 GMT 14 Oct 89

[Text] Kabul October 14 TASS—The Foreign Ministry of the Republic of Afghanistan made a statement in connection with American and Pakistani allegations that the Soviet Union has increased military aid to Afghanistan and has military advisers in the Republic.

The statement, in particular, says that the ballyhoo raised in Pakistan and the United States over increased Soviet military aid to Afghanistan and deliveries of ever new types of weapons to the country are designed to justify arms supplies to Afghan extremists and to continue the fratricidal war in Afghanistan.

There is irrefutable evidence that the Soviet Union and Afghanistan have fulfilled honestly and in full measure their obligations under Geneva Accords. At present the Afghan Army has high combat readiness and is capable of using any modern weapons. Therefore Afghanistan does not need to use Soviet servicemen to train its troops in the use of the above weapons, including Scud missiles.

Afghanistan is prepared to create conditions for a visit by American specialists to the launch pads of Scud missiles so that they could see for themselves the technical and combat skills of Afghan servicemen and the groundlessness of slanderous statements. Besides, it should be also stressed that the Geneva Accords do not have a single provision banning the use of foreign consultants and specialists. The U.S. and Pakistani Governments are better advised to fulfill their obligations stemming from the Geneva Accords instead of spreading lies.

As for Soviet military aid to Afghanistan, it takes place and its amount ensures the defense of the sovereignty, security and territorial integrity of our country. It is Afghanistan's inalienable right to provide the army with latest weapons in the case of foreign aggression. Those who want to ignore this right of ours, should pay attention to the fact that Pakistan receives increasing military aid, which by far exceeds its requirements. At present American military and political advisers work in that country.

Arming and training extremist groups with modern weapons, hiring and sending mercenaries to Afghan territory are done by the United States and Pakistan on an unprecedented scale. All this runs counter to the norms of international law. Arms deliveries to an independent and sovereign state on the basis of treaties and the clandestine arming of terrorist and sabotage groups is not one and the same thing.

Afghanistan states again that the continuation of war, tension in the country and the region are not in the interests of any of the sides involved in the conflict. The only way out of the situation is political settlement, the statement points out.

Afghan Foreign Minister Discusses Peace Efforts

PM1410185989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Oct 89 First Edition p 5

[Special correspondent A. Pecherskiy report on interview with Afghan Foreign Minister 'Abdul Wakil: "All Efforts for Peaceful Settlement"]

[Text] Kabul, 14 Oct—We agreed on this interview while still on the aircraft. 'Abdul Wakil, foreign minister of the Republic of Afghanistan, was returning to Kabul from the general political debate at the UN General Assembly's 44th session in New York. But the meeting we had scheduled almost failed to materialize, because on that day the Afghan capital came under intensive missile bombardment and movement around the city was risky.

...The current UN General Assembly session, 'Abdul Wakil said, was distinguished by an atmosphere of mutual understanding and cooperation. This is largely due to the new approaches toward international affairs adopted by the Soviet Union and the United States. Delegates' speeches noted a sensible and businesslike approach toward the solution of the Afghan problem: the need to unconditionally implement the Geneva agreements on ending the war in Afghanistan.

Conversations with the UN secretary general and the chairman of the General Assembly session on the question of drafting a new resolution on Afghanistan showed considerable similarity of opinions on the inclusion in the resolution of points proposed by the Afghan side. It ought to be recalled that the previous session also adopted a resolution on Afghanistan, but unfortunately Pakistan and some other countries did not make any significant efforts at all to implement it. Therefore the adoption of a new resolution may also prove ineffective.

Lately, the minister went on, world public opinion has been emphasizing the existence of conditions for a settlement of the Afghan question by political means. Note is being taken of the republic's ability to resist the opposition's onslaught in the conditions prevailing following the withdrawal of Soviet troops from the country, as well as of the futility of the extremists' attempts to achieve victory by military means.

People in the United States are also beginning to realize this, after a long time. Senator C. Pell, for example, expressed the opinion that the administration's line of overthrowing Afghanistan's government by military means is utopianism. The senator emphasized the need to review this policy.

The whole world knows that there are numerous contradictions on this question within the U.S. Administration. On the one hand voices can be heard supporting a political settlement, while on the other hand there is no end to the flow of arms to the "diehards." U.S. President Bush's speech at the session contained the good idea of calling on the United Nations to step up its activity in the resolution of conflicts.

The republic's government utilizes forums, conferences, and every opportunity to create conditions to end the war. The annual Islamic conference held in Kabul a few days ago was attended by eminent religious figures from the country and representatives from abroad. They unanimously supported the peace-loving proposals contained in President Najibullah's message.

The Afghan press recently published a declaration by the National Salvation Society, which includes representatives of different political parties. The publication of this document is an important step which merits attention. Even though we have, of course, serious differences with the National Salvation Society, its peacemaking activity will help to achieve mutual understanding among Afghans.

Growing disunity and contradictions can be seen among the Afghan opposition. Its military and moral prestige is declining daily in the eyes of world public opinion.

Unless a path to political settlement is found, the war may last a long time. And the republic's government is taking all possible measures to achieve national reconciliation in the country and a political settlement in the region, 'Abdul Wakil said in conclusion.

Updated Report on Afghan Military Situation

PM1510190589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Oct 89 Second Edition pp 1,7

[PRAVDA special correspondent A. Pecherskiy report: "Daily Life in Afghanistan"]

[Text] Kabul, 12 Oct— I was reluctant to believe that a real war is going on here. Even after a short trip around the city to show me areas which had been shelled and the marks of shrapnel on the walls cratered by rocket projectiles in the area where our embassy is located. It was difficult at first to grasp the atmosphere of something I had never seen in my life before. Especially as Kabul had not been shelled for several days. But during the briefing for foreign journalists at Afghanistan's Foreign Ministry there was the sound of shattering glass. A second explosion followed a while after the first somewhere not far away.

The military-political situation in the country remains complex. The opposition is besieging the major Afghan cities and the missile bombardment of strategic points in Afghanistan continues. Khowst has been the focus of the "diehards'" special attention for more than a month. The rebels' long-range artillery is constantly shelling the city. Units of the government forces are courageously repulsing attacks by the enemy, who has reportedly lost more than 2,000 men there recently. Reserve subunits from Kabul and other regions of the country have been sent to Khowst.

A concentration of opposition forces has been noted in the area surrounding Jalalabad. The opposition is trying to impede movement on the Kabul-Jalalabad road by means of artillery shelling. The Afghan Army is mounting combat operations in this area in order to ensure the security of the transportation artery.

Along the road across the Salang pass the rebels have tried to occupy several population centers. The "diehards" had to retreat beneath the army's blows: They left about 200 dead.

Qandahar is being successfully defended from rebel attacks. In the provinces of Zabol and Oruzgan fighting is under way in which detachments formed from local inhabitants are repulsing the mujahidin.

In the assessment of the Afghan leadership, moral and political disintegration is evident in the opposition ranks. With the withdrawal of Soviet troops it lost one of the main arguments for mobilizing the Muslims for a jihad—a holy war. The unceremonious interference in Afghanistan's internal affairs by staffers of Pakistan's special services and mercenaries from Saudi Arabia also exposes the "diehards'" position. The armed struggle among leaders of the opposition parties for zones of influence, the violence, and the brigandage carried out by bandit formations in the captured population centers continue. Thus in Konarha province three governors were killed in 3 weeks. 'n Konduz Province the rebels destroyed a woodworking factory and dismantled a power station's equipment and sold it to the Pakistanis.

The Afghan leadership continues to hold talks with the opposition field commanders. Two thirds of them have already signed an agreement on ceasing combat operations. Some are openly joining the government troops.

Iraqi Ambassador Hasayn Presents Credentials

LD1310124189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1158 GMT 13 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow, 13 Oct (TASS)—In the Kremlin today, Iraqi Ambassador Ghafil Jasim Hasayn handed his credentials to Anatoliy Lukyanov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The ambassador stressed that the two countries are linked by ties of friendship which have grown stronger over many years, in the course of which the USSR has lent Iraq sincere support in the resolution of national tasks. He affirmed Iraq's unchanging wish to expand long-term cooperation with the USSR in all spheres.

Accepting the ambassador's credentials on behalf of the Presidium and of the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Anatoliy Lukyanov noted that the USSR and Iraq have accumulated considerable experience of equal cooperation and that an active political dialogue is being carried out. This is creating the basis for the development and perfection of interaction between the two countries.

In the friendly conversation which took place subsequently, the question of an Iran-Iraq settlement was touched on. Anatoliy Lukyanov spoke in favor of speeding up this process on the basis of political realism and flexibility from both sides aimed at seeking mutually acceptable fundamental political solutions to existing problems. This would provide a firm foundation for the future peaceful development of Iraq and Iran and for the entire Persian Gulf region.

Yuliy Vorontsov, first deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, took part in the conversation.

Continued U.S. Presence in Gulf Criticized

NC1210212189 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1500 GMT 12 Oct 89

[Yuriy Andreyev commentary from "The World Today" feature]

[Text] Esteemed listeners: General Norman Schwarzkopf, the commander in chief of the U.S.' Central Command, CENTCOM, has said that the United States will maintain its military presence in the Persian Gulf. He was speaking at a news conference in Kuwait at the conclusion of his visit to that country and Saudi Arabia.

The U.S. general's speech contained typical American rhetoric. He spoke of international stability, general security, and the U.S. interest in peace and security and desire to ensure peace and prosperity for all Persian Gulf countries. It is possible that his main point, that is, the continuation of U.S. military presence in the Persian Gulf, might have been lost in this flood of eloquence. It is natural that Schwarzkopf buried this idea under a deceptive propagandistic veneer.

To justify the U.S. military presence in this region, the U.S. general said that the danger of war and clashes remain since Iran and Iraq have not yet signed a peace agreement. Gen Schwarzkopf seemed to contend that U.S. warships were a guarantee of security in the Persian Gulf.

However, we are not about to rush to agree with him. Every allegation is aimed at attaining specific political objectives and it is natural that the United States is also pursuing definite political objectives. First of all, the U.S. warships in the Persian Gulf can never establish peace in that region. U.S. warships were in the area before the outbreak of the Iran-Iraq war and could do nothing to prevent it. The war continued for 8 years and ended without any assistance from Washington.

Actually, the U.S. military presence only exacerbates tension and instability in this part of the world. In most cases, it has had catastrophic consequences. It is enough to recall how 290 people died when a U.S. warship downed an Iranian passenger airliner last July.

In some cases, it appears that the United States deliberately sought to inflame tensions. For example, Iran repeatedly declared that the U.S. warships were transmitting static, thus disrupting the Iranian patrol planes' radio contact. It is completely clear that such actions by the White House greatly aggravated the situation in the Persian Gulf region.

In brief, the facts indicate that the U.S. military presence in this area cannot be a guarantee of regional security and has an entirely different objective. It may be conjectured that, more than anything else, oil is the focus of U.S. interest and attention. We know that more than 70 percent of the world's oil reserves are concentrated in the Persian Gulf. It is for this reason that the United States seeks to keep this important strategic region under its own control.

The U.S. military presence can prove a valuable lever to exert pressure on the countries of the Persian Gulf, particularly Iran. It seems as if the Americans wish to prove that they are able to resolve political issues by military means should the need arise. In addition, the U.S. warships have assumed the role of a support unit for the U.S. allies in the region. For example, Norman Schwarzkopf's visit to Saudi Arabia and his statement on the Persian Gulf situation were made at a time of great strain in the relations between Riyadh and Tehran. In this way, Washington is seeking to capitalize on differences between Islamic countries to serve its own purposes.

It is possible that the United States may score a short-term tactical success with this policy, but it will suffer a defeat when it comes to long-term strategic goals. The era of the diplomacy of power and threats has ended and constructive dialogue, noninterference in internal affairs, and the absence of belligerence will mark the future course of international relations.

East Europe

GDR's Honecker Urges 'Open Dialogue' on Problems

PM1610081389 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 15 Oct 89 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "By Means of Open Dialogue"]

[Text] Berlin, 14 Oct—Urgent questions of the further shaping of a developed socialist society in the GDR were discussed at a meeting which E. Honecker, general secretary of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] Central Committee and chairman of the GDR State Council, held here with the leaders of friendly parties and the president of the GDR National Front National Council.

ADN has reported that E. Honecker briefed the meeting participants on the recent SED Central Committee Politburo session which discussed the tasks of preparing for the 12th SED Congress following the GDR's 40th anniversary.

The Politburo proceeds from the need to discuss together with all the country's citizens and all its democratic forces fundamental questions of the GDR's further social development in the light of the results achieved and the urgent requirements. It is important to decide together how we will respond to the difficult demands of the nineties so that a strong socialist GDR can cross the threshold into the next millennium. E. Honecker reported that the SED's proposals will be put to the whole people at the next SED Central Committee session. It is a question of further pursuing the policy of a united economic and social policy, of having an efficient

economy of benefit to everyone, of democratic coexistence and active cooperation, of a good range of goods for the GDR population and pay according to labor, of mass media linked with life, of opportunities to travel and a healthy environment. It is a question of the GDR's contribution to ensuring peace throughout the world.

We continue to be guided by the principle of doing everything with the people and everything for the people, E. Honecker emphasized. This is why we must preserve everything that has justified itself and overcome what is obsolete and hinders us. The new tasks must be tackled boldly and decisively. In the course of an open dialogue we will discuss the problems that arise.

The meeting participants declared that the tasks facing the GDR will be resolved by means of time-tested cooperation within the framework of the democratic bloc and the National Front.

Participating in the meeting were G. Maleuda, chairman of the Democratic Peasants' Party of Germany; G. Goetting, chairman of the Christian Democratic Union; M. Gerlach, chairman of the Liberal Democratic Party of Germany; H. Homann, chairman of the National Democratic Party of Germany; L. Kolditz, president of the GDR National Front National Council; J. Herrmann and G. Mittag, members of the Politburo and secretaries of the SED Central Committee.

GDR Politburo Statement on Refugee Exodus Cited

PM1310132389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Oct 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Socialist Unity Party of Germany Central Committee Politburo Statement"]

[Text] Berlin, 12 Oct—The socialist GDR is the result of the activity of all the people. It was created by the labor of its citizens, says a statement by the Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] Central Committee Politburo issued here today.

The document notes that having built and defended the socialist republic—as the power of the workers and peasants—by joint efforts, the people of the GDR were and remain resolute fighters for peace. The Politburo thanks all who created socialism on German soil and who prepared the celebration of the GDR's 40th anniversary, which was also commemorated by its true friends and militant comrades in arms. The presence of many guests from all over the world at the celebrations demonstrates the country's worthy place in the community of the peoples. The firm union with Lenin's party and the peoples of the Soviet Union and the parties of the other fraternal socialist countries was reaffirmed.

The SED's political will, the Politburo points out, is to create for the GDR people a life imbued with a belief in the future. But that is possible only through the unity of all citizens. In unity lies the strength of socialism in the GDR, and socialism in the GDR needs every citizen. It has a place and prospects for all. It is the future of the rising generation. Therefore, the Politburo is not indifferent to the abandonment of the GDR by those who used to live and work in it. There are various reasons for that move. We must find them together.

Many of those who have turned their backs on the GDR in recent months, the document stresses, were victims of a broadly planned act of provocation. The fact that FRG imperialism will never tolerate the existence of a socialist state on German soil has been reaffirmed. It has been violating treaties and flouting international law. The imperialist forces tried to use the celebration of the 40th anniversary of the GDR's formation as the moment to create doubts in socialism and its prospects and for that purpose launched an unbridled slander campaign through the mass media. They want to divert people from the main question of the present day—the safeguarding of peace.

Aspirations for a greater Germany, fed by old-fashioned revanchism and neofascism, have no chance, the SED Central Committee Politburo states. Demagoguery, enticement, and blackmail are not new methods for imperialism. The history of relations between the German states confirms that. Nor is the goal that it is pursuing—the elimination of socialism on German soil and the changing of the peaceful order in Europe—a new goal. While casting doubt on the postwar structure the FRG refuses to accept its joint responsibility to do its utmost to ensure that the threat of war never emanates from German soil again. In our day this is completely contrary to the interests of peace.

The GDR will continue to prevent encroachments on the power of the workers and peasants and on the values, ideals, and achievements of socialism. Its responsibility for ensuring its people's secure present and future demands that. Its fidelity to the memories of hundreds of thousands of German revolutionaries and true German patriots and the millions of victims of German fascism and militarism demands that. Its friends in the Warsaw Pact and throughout the world expect that from it, the statement points out.

The SED intends to continue pursuing the course of increasing the GDR people's well-being, working for peace throughout the world, and building a strong socialist state, the Politburo stresses in conclusion.

Levin on Statement, Mass Exodus

LD1310195889 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 13 Oct 89

[Text] [Presenter Ruvinskiy] And now, esteemed comrades, I wish to tell you about the events under way in the GDR. The press of that country nowadays is publishing readers' reactions to the statement of the Politburo of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] Central Committee. I will give you a reminder that this statement says that the political will of the SED consists in creating for the people of the GDR a life which is imbued with

confidence in the future. But this is possible only through uniting all citizens. It is precisely in this idea of uniting all citizens—the SED Central Committee Politburo has stressed—that the strength of socialism in the GDR, which needs every citizen, lies. Therefore, the Politburo is not indifferent to the rejection of the GDR by those who lived and worked in it. Reasons for such a step vary. It is necessary to expose them together. This is what the statement says. Today's edition of the BERLINER ZEITUNG newspaper contains a letter signed by the collective of innovators of the "Freight Transport" people's enterprise, which stresses that this statement has been received with approval and relief. Another letter says what is necessary is not only words but also deeds. And now I am asking my colleague Viktor Levin, who has just come back from a trip to the GDR, to explain what has, firstly, prompted the statement of the SED Central Committee Politburo and, second, how one should understand the public reaction to it.

[Levin] At issue is the emigration of a quite large number of persons—mainly young people under 30 years of age—from the GDR. In NEUES DEUTCHLAND of 4 October I saw a report which indicated that the labor departments in various regions of the FRG registered over 41,000 ex-citizens of the GDR as unemployed. This figure gives an idea of how many people have left. As you can see, this is an impressive figure, although by all accounts it is not all-inclusive. During the stay in Berlin at the celebrations of the 40th anniversary of the formation of the GDR, despite a ceremonial atmosphere, the question of those who had left the GDR was present in many places in one form or another. Quite naturally, I spoke about this with my colleagues, journalists of the GDR. The problem did not leave anyone indifferent. Without sharing the position of those who have left their country, my friends noted that this is a very complex issue in which it is necessary to dig down to its roots. The statement of the Politburo of the SED Central Committee adopted on 11 October reflects very clearly this ambition to dig down to the roots of the basis of a broad dialogue. This is what is being welcomed by GDR citizens who were not in any way satisfied with the original official statements which reduced the whole problem to intrigues by hostile intelligence services. One must say that these services have indeed put in their share, but in my view, to say that they could incite several tens of thousands of people to defect would mean a strong exaggeration of their possibilities.

[Ruvinskiy] Viktor Nikolayevich, you have mentioned your meetings and conversation with your colleagues, GDR journalists. How do they explain this mass emigration?

[Levin] Although I was not told this directly, the impression I have is that the essence of the problem is not so much material as political in nature. This does not mean that material considerations do not play any role. For example, I happened to hear the view that many doctors who have left the GDR are evidently banking on higher salaries. In the FRG doctors do earn very decently, although medical staff in the GDR do not get little either. I happened to talk to doctors in the FRG and I know that their incomes are indeed very high. But at the same time I know that there are no vacancies. And in order to become securely employed and obtain a permanent post, doctors have to overcome many obstacles. Whether this situation is assessed realistically by the doctors that have left the GDR is none of my concern, as the saying goes.

[Ruvinskiy] Let us nevertheless return to the statement of the SED Central Committee Politburo. I think it shows....

[Levin] Yes, it shows that the SED sees the problems as a whole without turning a blind eye to unpleasant facts. And this confirms that the SED with its intellectual potential, a wealth of experience, and political authority will be able to find, together with all public forces, answers to questions which have been raised on the agenda by the progress of the development of the republic and which worry its citizens. I should say this: the statement of the SED Central Committee Politburo is testimony to the realism and ability of the party to tackle any problems.

Further Reaction to Statement

LD1210220289 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 12 Oct 89

[Text] Today in the GDR a statement of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] Central Committee Politburo has been published. Our correspondent Aleksandr Zubenko reports from Berlin:

[Zubenko] The SED leadership statement has expressed gratitude to the working class, peasantry and all the working people and citizens of the GDR, for actively building socialism on German soil and for taking part in preparing the 40th anniversary of the republic. The statement outlines the viewpoint of the Politburo on a number of topical problems of the modern development of the GDR. I wish to give listeners a reminder that right before marking the 40th anniversary of the republic, about 50,000 people left the GDR for West Germany via Hungary, the CSSR and Poland. During the period of celebrating the 40th anniversary rather powerful demonstrations were held in Berlin, Drezden, Leipzig Karl Marx Stadt and some other cities of the country. Their participants—mainly young people—demanded democratic reforms, freedom of emigration, freedom of the press etc. There were also, of course some extremist escapades and allegations. The mass information media of the GDR tried to account for what was happening mainly by the subversive activities of the West. These are the recent events.

The present Politburo statement—perhaps for the first time—says that the cause of these phenomena can exist in the GDR, too. We, the statement says, must and will look for them. At the same time, it also notes that many

of those who turned their backs on the republic in the recent months have become victims of a provocation conspired on a broad scale.

Imperialist forces thought that they had found during the celebrations of the 40th anniversary of the formation of the GDR an appropriate moment to sow the seed of doubt in socialism and its prospects with the aid of a frenzied campaign waged by mass information media, the statement stresses. In my view, an important point in the Politburo address is a call for a dialogue and for the political unity of society. Incidentally, in some constituencies of the republic local party leadership has already started this dialogue. The SED has provided assurances in the document that at the next Central Committee plenum, which is being awaited by many political observers already in the near future, the party will submit a strategic concept of the country's further development for the consideration of the working people. It's basis is consistency and renewal. The Politburo statement also contains the call for the population to make their thoughts and proposals known to the upcoming party congress scheduled for May next year about the construction of socialism in the 1990's.

We—the statement says—wish to find a joint answer to the question of how we will react to difficult requirements of the next decade in the sense of humanist ideals of socialism.

ADN Cites GDR Organizations' Calls for Reforms

LD1310131289 Moscow TASS in English 1201 GMT 13 Oct 89

[Text] Berlin 13/10/ TASS—The GDR news agency ADN reports:

The Academy of Arts of the GDR has come out for more publicity at all levels of society. A statement to this effect by the academy presidium was spread by the GDR media one day after a far-reaching offer for dialogue was made by the leadership of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany.

Socialism needs public thinking as an instrument and corrective of its plans, as an intermediary between historical claims and every-day experience, the statement says. No question of importance must be withheld. Trust is based on trust. "We need it as a basic value of social intercourse. "Voicing concern about the future of this country must not arouse suspicion." [quotation marks as received]

The statement speaks of "a feeling of helplessness in the face of tutelage" which arises from anonymous decisions from the top and which is contrary to the image of a mature citizen propagated by the media. This led to "critical disruptions of the moral and spiritual climate in the society", the statement said.

The academy statement cites anti-fascism, love of peace, social justice, and the fostering and augmenting of culture as basic intellectual positions and permanent fields of work in the GDR.

"We have not yet arrived. We have to hold our ground", the authors of the statement say referring to the other German state, which neighbours the GDR.

Socialism as alternative to the bourgeois order continues to face the challenge of achieving the material, intellectual and moral productivity which enables it to win through.

The politburo of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany released an analysis of the situation and its proposals for discussion, marking the start of a joint search for ways to make socialism more attractive.

Contributing to the discussion is also the country's League of Culture, which has shared responsibility of government throughout the 40 years of the GDR's existence. The presidium of the League said in a statement that everything that had to be changed in the GDR would be clearly named—consistently and without delay.

"Intrusive calls for reforms which are tabled by enemies of socialism every day cannot prevent us from reforming what we consider worth reforming for the benefit of socialism", the League said. It would not give up its previous decision "in favour of the humanist renaissance of society, against captialist restoration". A comprehensive peace policy and a dialogue of reason, the GDR as the anti-fascist alternative, social security and real humanism were lasting values for the league, it said.

GDR's Hager Attends Culture Festival in USSR

Opening Cermonies Reported

PM1610092089 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Oct 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "In the Traditions of Friendship"]

[Excerpts] The GDR Culture Festival in the Soviet Union to mark the 40th anniversary of the first worker-peasant state on German soil will have truly unionwide scope. The itineraries of the fraternal country's envoys will pass through 50 cities, in all the union republics. Soviet audiences will encounter illustrious collectives and performers and become acquainted with new movies and works of music and visual art.

The opening ceremony of the festival took place in the Great Hall of the Moscow Conservatory on 12 October. It was attended by Comrades L.N. Zaykov and Yu.A. Manayenkov, representatives of the public, and cultural figures. Also in the auditorium was a GDR delegation headed by K. Hager, member of the Politburo and secretary of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] Central Committee, and G. Koenig, GDR ambassador to the USSR.

M.A. Gribanov, USSR first deputy minister of culture, conveyed wishes for success to the participants in the festival. In a reply speech H.J. Hoffmann, GDR minister of culture, expressed cordial gratitude for the hospitality and wished Soviet people success in perestroyka in all spheres of society's life.

It was stressed in the speeches that the 40 years of the GDR's existence have been marked by progressive, all-around development of fraternal ties between the peoples of the USSR and the GDR. The friendly meetings between M.S. Gorbachev and E. Honecker in Berlin during the celebrations of the republic's jubilee were of great significance for deepening these ties. The meetings once again demonstrated our unity on all questions of principle.

The honor of opening the festival was given to the Leipzig Gewandhaus Symphony Orchestra, under conductor Kurt Masur.

The program for the culture festival is varied. One remarkable event is the exhibition "Brilliant Dresden," which opened on the same day at the A.S. Pushkin Fine Arts Museum. It brings together 350 very interesting exhibits. Here you can see works by Rembrandt, Van Dyck, and Velasquez, as well as the world famous works of Meissen China.

The festival has also begun in other Soviet cities. Thus in Leningrad a tour by the Dresden State Opera has opened. The stage of the S.M. Kirov Academy Theater was made available to the guests for 4 days, and Mozart's comic opera "Cosi Fan Tutte" was given. The second show is Beethoven's "Fidelio." This opera was premiered only a few days ago in the GDR.

On 13 October a long-term CPSU-SED prospectus on the development of USSR-GDR cultural cooperation for the period through the year 2000 was signed at the CPSU Central Committee. It was signed on behalf of the fraternal parties by V.A. Medvedev, Politburo member and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and K. Hager, Politburo member and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

A talk took place between V.A. Medvedev and K. Hager, during which questions of further deepening collaboration in the sphere of ideology, science, and culture were discussed. Taking part in the exchange of opinions were A.Ya. Degtyarev, R.P. Fedorov, and V.K. Yegorov, deputy chiefs of the CPSU Central Committee Ideology and International Departments; M.A. Gribanov and Yu.M. Khilchevskiy, USSR deputy ministers of culture, and, on the SED side, SED Central Committee members H.J. Hoffmann, GDR minister of culture, U. Ragwitz, chief of the SED Central Committee Culture Department, and G. Koenig, GDR ambassador to the USSR. [passage omitted]

The delegation headed by K. Hager, Politburo member and secretary of the SED Central Committee, which is taking part in the GDR Culture Festival, laid a wreath at the V.I. Lenin Mausoleum on 13 October. A wreath was also laid at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier by the Kremlin Wall.

Medvedev, Hager Sign Cultural Program

LD1310124489 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1220 GMT 13 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow (ADN)—The Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] and the CPSU intend to promote still closer cooperation between the GDR and the USSR in the intellectual-cultural area. A long-term conception of the two parties, which lasts until the year 2000, was agreed upon in Moscow on Friday.

Concrete tasks were the regular exchange of artistic works, the expansion of personal contacts between cultural workers, and the promotion of exchanges of experience. Particular attention was devoted to cooperation between young artists. Study trips, work study progress, and exchanges of training programs should be used for this just as much as the staging of international competitions and festivals by young artists of the socialist countries.

The conception underlines the responsibility of the SED and the CPSU for the preservation and development of the national culture and language of Soviet citizens of German nationality.

The conception was signed by Kurt Hager, member of the Politburo and secretary of the SED Central Committee, and Vadim Medvedev, member of the politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

Hager Ends Visit, Departs

LD1410145589 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 14 Oct 89

[Text] Hager, member of the Politburo and secretary of the SED [Socialist Unity Party of Germany], left Moscow for home today. He headed a delegation at the GDR Days of Culture in the USSR devoted to the 40th anniversary of the GDR.

Shevardnadze-Fischer Exchange of Messages Cited

PM1610080989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Oct 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Exchange of Telegrams"]

[Text] Greetings telegrams on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the USSR and the GDR were exchanged by the two countries' foreign ministers.

An event of historic importance in relations between the USSR and the GDR, E.A. Shevardnadze's telegram notes, occurred on 15 October 1949: Our countries' governments decided to exchange diplomatic missions. This was essentially the first foreign policy act by the young German state of workers and peasants, and it was

of fundamental importance for establishing the GDR's sovereignty and independence and for the republic's emergence in the international arena.

The last 40 years have been a period of onward development of all-around cooperation between our countries, of their collaboration as allies in the cause of strengthening European and universal security. The meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and E. Honecker in Berlin a few days ago offered convincing confirmation of the scale and dynamism of the present stage in relations between the USSR and the GDR.

O. Fischer's telegram says that the Soviet Union's diplomatic recognition of the first socialist state of workers and peasants on German soil was especially significant for the GDR. It was proof of great confidence in the GDR communists and working people, and opened the door to the international arena for the republic.

Over the last 4 decades our states have established fruitful cooperation for the benefit of people and in the interests of strengthening socialism and peace. The GDR perceives the close fraternal alliance with Lenin's country as a firm guarantee of its successful socialist development. The strengthening and deepening of friendship and comprehensive collaboration remain our main task and international duty.

Medvedev Meets GDR Academy of Sciences President

PM1310113789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Oct 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "President of GDR Academy of Sciences Received"]

[Text] V.A. Medvedev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, received W. Scheler, president of the GDR Academy of Sciences, who is visiting the USSR.

They had a conversation, during which they discussed questions of the further development of USSR-GDR scientific cooperation.

G.I. Marchuk, president of the USSR Academy of Sciences; G. Koenig, GDR ambassador to the USSR; A.Ya. Degtyarev, first deputy head of the CPSU Central Committee Ideological Department; and other comrades took part in the meeting.

Hungarian Socialist Party Congress Ends

Results Noted

LD1010220289 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 10 Oct 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast; video report by Yevgeniy Shirokov]

[Text] The Hungarian Socialist Party [HSP] congress has ended in Budapest. In its concluding stage the HSP charter and policy statement were adopted and the party presidium consisting of 24 people [as heard] and representing mainly reformist direction was elected. The peculiarity of this fact is that with the exception of the delegates to the congress, the members of the former Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party [MSZMP] from the depths of which the HSP has risen, have not yet been organizationally incorporated in the new party. [video shows voting going on, Nyers speaking to microphone] Any of them can obtain a new party card by 31 October by signing provided they agree with the charter and the policy document. However, will all of them want to do this? This is an open question. [video shows an overall view of the congress hall, audience applauding] Letters addressed to the congress have arrived from some primary organizations, the members of which want to stick to the MSZMP position. Some of those who here at the congress gave their support to the establishment of the new party said that they intend to unite themselves into a platform of a more leftist orientation and to adhere to their own views of the methods of socialist construction.

The congress approved the HSP nomination of Imre Pozsgay as presidential candidate at the coming elections. [video shows warmly applauding audience, Pozsgay rising and greeting the audience]

The delegates to congress spoke in favor of celebrating—starting from this year—23 October as a day of national reconciliation. [video shows an overall view of calm proceedings at the congress] On this day, in 1956, the events started in Hungary, which overspilled into bloody skirmishes with a tragic outcome for thousands of Hungarians who found themselves then on various sides of the barricades. [video shows peaceful life in the streets of today's budapest]

In the current situation when the country's economy is in crisis and life for many people is becoming harder, supporters of the West are attempting to turn people toward the shopwindows and social models of capitalist countries and to isolate socialist values. Such people do exist also among the ultrareformists in the present HSP. [video shows more scenes of everyday life in the streets of Budapest, focuses on people buying their newspapers at a kiosk, a close up of title page of NEPSZAVA carrying a picture of Nyers] But on its flag, and in its program are the words democratic socialism, and Hungarian society, which is renewing itself, must help to achieve this objective.

Rezso Nyers was elected chairman of the HSP. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev sent him a congratulatory telegram.

Nyers Describes Work of Congress

LD1110165989 Moscow TASS in English 1427 GMT 11 Oct 89

[Text] Budapest October 11 TASS—Chairman of the Hungarian Socialist Party [HSP] Rezso Nyers described

the work of the party congress, its decisions, aims and the party's course, speaking to voters at the HSP electoral centre.

The fact that representatives of all trends had a chance to express their opinions was an important feature of the party congress, Nyers noted. Various views inside the party were presented as platforms. If this had not happened, the party would not have been able to preserve its unity.

He noted that "crisis" situations developed repeatedly during the congress. They were overcome thanks to the readiness for compromises and not due to the party leadership's influence.

At the same time Nyers did not deny the importance of disputes which took place outside the congress hall. The HSP leader pointed out that unity forged at the congress would be a characteristic feature of the new "multiplatform' party.

The discussion on how the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party (HSWP) would transform into the HSP was a much disputed question at the congress. Radical delegates proposed the HSWP's dissolution and the creation of a totally new party. Their opponents suggested that the HSWP should be renewed instead of establishing a new party.

Speaking about the attitude of the international community to the congress's decisions, the HSP leader said that they met with understanding. The socialist countries in general and the Soviet Union in particular welcomed the report on the HSP's formation, he said. [Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 12 October 1989 in its First Edition on page 4 publishes a TASS report citing Nyers's remarks which is identical to this one, except that it omits the third, fourth, and last paragraphs]

Hungary's Grosz Cited on Party Split

LD1410121389 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0925 GMT 14 Oct 89

[Report from Budapest by correspondent Yevgeniy Shirokov]

[Excerpts] [Shirokov] The party forum which began as an extraordinary congress of the Hungarian Socialist Wotkers Party [MSZMP] and which ended as the congress of the Hungarian Socialist Party caused a stir with its stormy debates and has passed into history. [passage omitted]

We have spent 4 days here in Budapest's congress center and we have seen how events, which have sometimes taken on a dramatic character, have been unfolding. Karoly Grosz, general secretary of the MSZMP, spoke to us just before the start of the congress about the sharpness of the forthcoming discussions. Let's go back a few days:

[Begin Grosz recording in Hungarian with superimposed Russian translation] The members of the party have great expectations of the congress. The stakes are very high. It is a matter of which direction the MSZMP'S policy will take and this, incidentally, determines the future destiny of the renewal of socialism in Hungary. The question of whether a united party is to be retained or whether it will split into various tendencies, must be resolved. A significant section of our communists have lost their bearings and are confused, and it is on how the congress goes that their confidence in the party depends. The divergences in positions bear witness to the fact that excessive passions are raging inside the party. One hears statements of a personal nature, not fully elaborated theoretical positions, which have to serve as a basis for the further renewal and development of the party and socialism in Hungary. The program which will be discussed has within it signs of this renewal. Much will depend on the leadership which the congress will elect, that is, on the personality factor will depend whether the party will be retained as a leftist party of the communist and workers' movement or whether it will take a step to the right, something which could have tragic consequences for Hungary. [end recording] [passage omitted]

PRAVDA Cites Hungarian Socialist Party Appeal

PM1310113589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Oct 89 First Edition p 4

[Own correspondent V. Gerasimov report: "Appeal by the Hungarian Socialist Party"]

[Text] Budapest, 11 Oct—The newspaper NEPSZABADSAG today published an appeal by the Hungarian Socialist Party congress. It says:

"Comrades!

"The Hungarian Socialist Party was founded 7 October. It is the heir of Hungarian leftwing progressive thinking, a champion of democratic socialism.

"The Hungarian Socialist Party is publishing its program declaration and statute and appeals to all who agree with its principles and strivings and wish to help the nation's upsurge to join it.

"We expect that the majority of Hungarian Socialist Workers Party [MSZMP] members will accept the new party's political program and democratic principles of activity. The Hungarian Socialist Party believes that it naturally stems from all those who participated in the MSZMP's activity honestly and with sincere belief.

"We call to our ranks those comrades who agree with our decisions and are ready to actively participate in their implementation.

"We await our compatriots, champions of socialist values!"

Hungarian Party's Organizational Tasks Noted

PM1310100389 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 13 Oct 89 First Edition p 5

[Unattributed report: "Hungary: Session of the Hungarian Socialist Party Presidium"]

[Text] The first session of the Hungarian Socialist Party [MSZP] Presidium has been held in Budapest, MTI reports. Speaking at it, E. Kovacs, member of the MSZP Presidium, said that the congress could only provide the foundation for the party's political work—the MSZP's political complexion will be determined by its subsequent actions. The MSZP Presidium considers it its duty to implement the congress' decisions as rapidly as possible.

E. Kovacs confirmed the congress' decision regarding MSZP property. After explaining the minimum need for it, rights to this property will be left to the government's discretion. The MSZP Presidium supported the Council of Ministers' proposal that the worker militia should be transformed into an organization to combat the consequences of natural disasters.

According to a congress decision, party members must state whether they are willing to join the MSZP or not before 31 October. The MSZP Presidium proposed that the party's leading workers and its functionaries should state their intention of joining the MSZP before 20 October. In this connection the reorganization of the central party apparatus must be completed before 20 November and grassroots party organizations formed before 10 November.

As for the activity of various platforms within the party, the MSZP Presidium gave them an opportunity to use various party premises, including its Central Committee building, for meetings and rallies.

E. Kovacs expressed a desire for former MSZMP [Hungarian Socialist Workers Party] representatives to set up an MSZP parliamentary group within the Hungarian State Assembly.

The MSZP Presidium pointed out that, in accordance with the party statutes, the MSZP Board should be elected by local party organizations before the beginning of next January.

Zaykov Arrives in Prague for Moscow Days Fesitval

LD1510100489 Moscow TASS in English 0955 GMT 15 Oct 89

[Text] Prague October 15 TASS—Lev Zaykov, member of the Politburo, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Moscow city party committee, arrived here for the Moscow Days festival.

At the airport he was welcomed by Miroslav Stepan, member of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and first secretary of the Prague city party committee, and other officials.

The welcoming party included Soviet Ambassador to Czechoslovakia Viktor Lomakin.

Zaykov on Moscow Days in Prague

LD1510211189

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1800 GMT on 15 October in the "Vremya" newscast broadcasts a report by correspondent S. Andreyev about the "Moscow: Capital of the USSR" exhibition, which opened today in Prague as part of the "Moscow Days" festival. Lev Zaykov, first secretary of the Moscow City party committee, speaks with S. Andreyev at the exhibit in Prague:

"[Zaykov] I think that the trend we have started here is toward establishing more joint enterprises and drawing the interest of our Czech friends—not just the ones from Prague, because in Moscow there are about 1,200 enterprises of different kinds—with whom we could cooperate or carry out the transfer of licences or even the supply of a number of goods to Prague or to Czechoslovakia.

"[Andreyev] This is a necessary matter, but I think that here there is also a large amount of accumulated experience of dealing with social problems, for instance, assistance to young families and support for pensioners and invalids, construction of individual houses right in the city itself, and the food supply. Is a study of this experience envisaged?

"[Zaykov] We want not only to learn but also, undoubtedly, while taking on board this experience, to agree, somehow, with our friends that Muscovites should also help us in this area. That is, to share experience and to begin joint work also in Moscow."

S. Andreyev concludes by giving a general roundup of some of the events to be held as part of the "Moscow Days." [video shows general views of the park, the exhibition, Zaykov walking around and speaking to correspondent]

PRAVDA Cites Jakes Report to CPCZ Plenum

PM1310095989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Oct 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Plenum Decisions"]

[Text] Prague, 12 Oct—The Czechoslovak Communist Party [CPCZ] Central Committee plenum finished work here today. Its participants discussed the report delivered by M. Jakes, general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee, on the party's activity since the last plenum and its tasks in the runup to the 18th CPCZ Congress.

Questions of party policy in the environmental protection sphere were also discussed, and the CPCZ's new draft rules were examined.

The closing speech at the plenum was delivered by M. Jakes. He stressed that in the period ahead the party will have to resolve quite a few complex tasks. The main role in resolving them will be played by Communists' activeness and the strengthening of the party's ties with working people. It is necessary, the speaker stressed, to set society in motion and to mobilize all forces which adhere to socialist positions so as to approach the 18th CPCZ Congress with good results.

It is important now to focus attention on preparing the CSSR economy for operation in conditions of the economic reform which will get underway at the beginning of 1990. In the future, too, it is necessary to consistently conduct the process of democratizing social life and creating on the basis of the National Front the corresponding preconditions for constructive dialogue and the participation of the broadest strata of society in the management of the state and the solution of the problems that occur. Our goal is to consolidate socialism through restructuring and democratization, not to dismantle it.

The priority in the foreign policy sphere for the CSSR remains the development of cooperation with the socialist countries, first and foremost the Soviet Union, M. Jakes stressed.

Further on Jakes Report to Plenum

PM1310135989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Oct 89 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "At the Czechoslovak Communist Party Central Committee Plenum"]

[Text] The political situation in Czechoslovakia is on the whole stable, Czechoslovak Communist Party [CPCZ] policy is supported by the people, and perestroyka and democratization are penetrating increasingly actively into the life of the broadest strata of society, M. Jakes, general secretary of the Czechoslovak Communist Party Central Committee, stated in his report at a CPCZ Central Committee Plenum, which opened today.

Dwelling on problems of socioeconomic development, M. Jakes noted that the process of perestroyka is not proceeding everywhere as it was envisaged, and a strong force of inertia, encouraging old methods of work and an undemanding attitude to carrying out tasks, can be felt in many areas.

In the report particular attention was paid to preparation for the 18th CPCZ Congress to be held in May next year. The party must lead the social movement, impart to it the right direction, and strengthen its authority and its leading role, M. Jakes stressed. Speaking about the new CPCZ draft statute, he noted that the document must meet the new conditions of the party's work and correspond to its tasks in the process of perestroyka and democratization.

In the period that has elapsed, the rapporteur continued, opposition groups in Czechoslovakia have carried out a number of actions with the support of certain Western political circles and mass media. Their aim is to abuse the process of perestroyka and democratization in order to destabilize socialism in Czechoslovakia and weaken the party's role. They have not achieved their intentions. The political decisions that we adopted were supported by the majority of Czechoslovak citizens. A new feature in the activity of this group is the support given to them not just by the West, but also by other opposition forces and various groups in certain socialist countries.

When dwelling on international problems, M. Jakes stated that Czechoslovakia fully supports the documents adopted at the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee Conference in Bucharest, and is advocating disarmament, and strengthening stability, trust and security in Europe and the whole world. Developing comprehensive cooperation with the USSR is of urgent and vital importance to Czechoslovakia. We show complete solidarity with the unremitting efforts of the CPSU and its leadership, and the Soviet people, in implementing the restructuring of Soviet society in the interests of strengthening socialism and we wish them success in this great revolutionary matter. It is of extraordinary significance for the future of socialism throughout the world, M. Jakes stressed.

CPCZ Aide on Bloc Influence on Reform Pressure

PM1510132589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent L. Kornilov report: "Following Czechoslovak Communist Party Central Committee Plenum"]

[Text] Prague—The latest Czechoslovak Communist Party [CPCZ] Central Committee Plenum was held here 11-12 October. Following established tradition, a press conference for Czechoslovak and foreign journalists was called immediately after it ended its work. Senior party Central Committee officials described the plenum's decisions and replied to numerous questions.

The attention of journalists was drawn to to the report by M. Jakes, general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee, on the party's activity since the previous plenum and its tasks in preparing for the 18th CPCZ Congress, as well as to the plenum's "ecological part"—the debate which followed a report by I. Knotek, member of the Presidium and secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee.

One of the questions asked at the press conference concerned the construction of the Gabcikovo-Nagymaros hydroelectric power complex. Was it discussed at the plenum? The answer was that the Central

Committee did not make a special statement on this matter, since it is primarily of a scientific and technical nature. But the problems in question were discussed in detail during the meeting between L. Adamec and M. Nemeth, heads of government of the CSSR and the Hungarian People's Republic respectively, in Prague a few days ago.

Your correspondent asked:
"The report delivered by Comrade M. Jakes at the plenum said that the activity of opposition groupings in the CSSR is being noticeably 'internationalized' and that a new element has emerged there: They receive support not only from Western countries, as before, but also from sundry opposition and legal forces in some socialist countries, especially in Poland and Hungary. It was also noted that 'actions by various groups in the USSR also have their effect.' Which groups in our country were meant?"

The answer was as follows:
"The Czechoslovak press, and specifically our party press, contains extensive information on this topic and now I am in no position to give you fuller information that that published in our mass media."

Of course, this kind of news conference calls for laconic answers, this is obvious. Nonetheless, it is a pity that the answer proved so brief and, I would say, evasive. I for one thought that this would have been an occasion for discussion on a particular interesting and still almost unexplored topic: How do situations, events, forces, and individual personalities in fraternal countries generally influence the situation and development in their brother-countries? I do not wish to give the impression that I am drawing some sort of far-reaching conclusions from a purely workaday event like a press conference. No! These are just ideas which crossed my mind "by the way."

The really serious lessons which can be learned from the CPCZ Central Committee plenum are much more important and much more instructive. The current political moment, the preparation for the 18th CPCZ Congress, the examination of the new draft party statute—these are matters so close to what is now perturbing Soviet Communists and all our people. And the ecology questions discussed at the plenum are so important that every fresh step toward their solution must be, I feel, most carefully studied by us as well.

Moiseyev Attends Czechoslovak Embassy Reception

PM1310084989 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 7 Oct 89 Second Edition p 5

[Unattributed report: "Embassy Reception"]

[Text] On 6 October Major General J. Mrazek, military and air attache at the CSSR Embassy in the USSR, gave a reception marking the 45th anniversary of the Czechoslovak People's Army. Present at the reception were Army General M.A. Moiseyev, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff and USSR first deputy defense minister; Army General V.L. Govorov; Marshal of the Soviet Union N.V. Ogarkov; and other officials. h1

Polish Economic Policy Guidelines Published

PM1310154189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Economic Program Published"]

[Text] Warsaw, 12 Oct—The basic principles and directions of the Polish Government's economic program have been published here. The document shows the Mazowiecki cabinet's intention to push through a radical and rapid restructuring of the economic structures to build a "market system approaching that which exists in highly developed countries."

The program envisages stabilizing the economy primarily through curbing inflation and transforming the economic system. The measures will be carried out in two stages. During the first stage, which will last until the beginning of 1990 at the very latest, the government intends to takes steps to curb the rate of growth in prices, limit the state budget deficit, and restore confidence in the zloty.

The planned measures to improve the economic situation include modernizing the wages indexation system and the tax mechanism, fighting monopolistic practice, a tougher credit policy, the gradual complete elimination of price regulation, the beginning of the selling off of certain kinds of state property, the restriction of subsidies, including those for public and political organizations, and the restriction of expenditure on public security and national defense needs.

Polish Government's Economic Program Viewed

PM1510183189 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 13 Oct 89 Second Edition p 5

[V. Masterov article: "Resolute Actions Needed. Polish Government's Economic Program"]

[Text] Warsaw—"Too good an opportunity to miss; our prices have gone up by only 300 percent." This invitation to look in a store was quite recently a newspaper cartoon, but today it is, alas, a reality in the stores reflecting the free food market which has become part of Poles' daily life.

I know from my own experience. I buy bread, milk, and kefir every morning, and in Warsaw food stores open at 0600.... In summer everything was... one-tenth the price. Prices change so rapidly that there are simply no prices marked on certain products. "Sorry, we still don't know the prices today, but it'll certainly be more expensive tomorrow," a storekeeper who has not lost his sense of humor joked to defuse the atmosphere, an APN correspondent in Poland reports to SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA.

While newspapers and television were investigating who planted the "inflation bomb," doubling gasoline prices in a short time, one thing was clear: The consequences have once again affected everyone rather than just automobile owners. Prices of bread, of dairy and meat products, and in the service sphere—everywhere deliveries are made by truck—skyrocketed.

New customs tariffs on imported vodka, automobiles, and automobile spares have just entered into force. In the case of vodka the increase in duty amounts to... 2,000 percent. The payment for importing automobiles has also risen considerably. For instance, at the beginning of October customs took Z2.7 million for a second-hand Mercedes, whereas the figure is now almost Z10 million. Major measures. For vodka was imported privately into Poland in consignments of thousands of bottles which, like the carloads of spares, were snatched up in the country and did not bring any profits to the state purse.

Incidentally, when the increased duty was introduced, lines of vehicles many kilometers long formed at Polish-Czechoslovak border crossings. Czechoslovak border guards even organized a separate line for Polish vehicles. Small "Zuks" [Polish truck for hire] immediately proliferated in this favorable environment, offering passage across the border in 2 hours for Z40,000-45,000 and Kcs250-300 from the Polish and Czechoslovak sides respectively.

A free canteen opened on one side of the capital's main Marszalkowska Street on almost the same day as an air passenger service center and the "Marriott" Hotel opened on the other. Every day more people wanting to obtain a cup of hot soup frequent the canteen under the trusteeship of the Polish Red Cross. But the cheapest single room in the chic ultramodern hotel with Italian and French cuisine costs $165. Well, these contrasts do not exist only in Poland.

It is well known that exactly 1 month ago, 12 September, Premier Tadeusz Mazowiecki said in his program speech that the new government would make a clear break with the past. Time is passing and people, who are constantly reminded that their current life is the "result of 45 years," are beginning to demand resolute steps from the people they voted for. That is why I can say without exaggeration that the whole of Poland was waiting for the first submission of the government's economic program. Leszek Balcerowicz, deputy chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers and minister of finance, acquainted them with the draft program at a meeting with journalists.

L. Balcerowicz said straightaway that the program has two main aims—to attack inflation and switch to a market system based on forms of ownership proven to have good results worldwide, freeing people's initiative, and consequently boosting the standard of living. Moreover, it envisages two phases. The first—through the end of 1989—entails retarding price hikes, abandoning intermediary and monopoly structures, and countering excessive increases in income. The second phase—through the end of 1990—entails the radical suppression of inflation by a firm financial policy, resolute restrictions on subsidies, and also changes in the correlation between increases in prices and incomes.

L. Balcerowicz also underlined Poland's opportunities to obtain Western financial support. He cited personal talks with representatives of the IMF and Western countries' finance ministers and U.S. President G. Bush's initiatives. Incidentally, as of today, real financial support for Poland totals more than $2 billion.

Well, the program for reviving the Polish economy looks both really determined and incisive. But is it new enough to answer recent claims that it is impossible to effect changes in the economy without changing political structures? On analyzing the "Balcerowicz program," it is easy to detect common ground between it—and many people have noticed this—and the Rakowski and Sekula programs, that is, the previous government's proposals and what the Polish United Workers Party is now calling for.

Mazowiecki's government has a tremendous credit of trust in society. But, ZYCIE WARSZAWY notes, you must recall, however, that credits are often short-term in conditions of high inflation.

Yakovlev Meets With Romania's Stoian 10 Oct

PM1110144689 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Oct 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading "Interparty Contacts"]

[Text] On 10 October A.N. Yakovlev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, met with I. Stoian, candidate member of the Romanian Communist Party [RCP] Central Committee Political Executive Committee and secretary of the RCP Central Committee, who stopped over in Moscow on his way from Pyongyang to Bucharest. There was an exchange of opinions on topical questions of CPSU-RCP cooperation.

I. Bucur, Romanian ambassador to the USSR, took part in the meeting, which passed in a friendly atmosphere.

Romania's Party Recruitment Drive Reported

PM1210135289 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Oct 89 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent V. Vedrashko report under the rubric "Life in the Fraternal Parties": "The Worthiest People To Join the Party"]

[Text] Bucharest, 10 Oct—The recently published theses for the 14th Romanian Communist Party [RCP] Congress state that, as the people's nerve center, the party

does not stand above society, but operates within it, thereby exercising a leading role through its organizations and through the mass of Communists.

This is the spirit in which the party committee of Dabuleni commune in Dolj Judet works. Here considerable attention is devoted to increasing the party's ranks. The main criterion for joining the ranks of the RCP is a high level of political and professional training. These qualities do not appear of their own accord. Kristina Pyrvenush [as transliterated], deputy secretary of the party committee, notes:

"The political and organizational work done in 1988 and so far this year has made it possible to train and then admit to the party the worthiest of the working people. Each member of the party committee bureau is responsible for the activity of one or two primary party organizations as regards the education of the young generation. For instance, Marchel Marin [as transliterated], member of the party committee bureau, is in charge of the primary organization of our commune's agricultural cooperative. He helped this cell to organize systematic, planned work to admit cooperative members to the party, primarily from among young activists and production frontrunners who are also exemplary in their public and family life."

There are also primary party organizations in the commune of Dabuleni which have not admitted a single individual in the past year. This outcome is regarded by the party committee as a consequence of unsatisfactory work with young people.

Economic Cooperation With Romania Analyzed

LD1210141989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent V. Volodin report: "The Raw Material Factor. Notes about Soviet-Romanian Economic Ties"]

[Text] Bucharest—"...Let's hope the pipe holds..." I overheard this phrase, uttered half-jokingly over champagne during the signing ceremony of the protocol on commodity turnover between the USSR and Romania which provides for the delivery of 7.3 billion cubic meters of gas to Romania. For the first time this year gas, having outstripped petroleum, coal, coking stock, and ferrous and nonferrous rolled metal, not to mention machines and equipment, has become the number one commodity in Soviet-Romanian trade. Otherwise, the document does not differ much from its predecessors in that it continues to reflect the raw material bias of Soviet exports to Romania.

It is no secret that during 1965-1980 the USSR's share of Romania's foreign trade decreased steadily. Romania's rapid industrial development called for purchases of modern technology and equipment from Japan, the United States, the FRG, Italy, and France, financed mainly by credits. A number of plants built during the postwar period with Soviet technical assistance were also retooled with Western equipment. As a result of this development in Romania's foreign economic ties, the USSR's share in the Romanian commodity turnover decreased from 39 to 17 percent.

However, at the turn of the decade, the situation began to change. During 1981-1985 Soviet-Romanian commodity turnover increased by 70 percent, totaling R17.7 billion. Without question, this was influenced by the signing of a number of integration documents. However, I believe that the serious difficulties which Romania encountered at the beginning of the eighties provided just as strong a stimulus.

The large-scale production complex created during the years of reconstruction began to experience shortages of raw materials, electricity, and fuel. A major conquest of Western markets by goods produced by this complex failed to materialize. In conditions of a mounting foreign debt, Romania began to pay more attention to the development of economic dialogue with the Soviet Union in an effort to secure raw materials and orders for its production capacities. The USSR responded. One of the consequences of the resumption of dynamic growth of commodity turnover in the eighties was increased Soviet exports of goods in the raw material and fuel group, which led to a reduction of the share of machinery equipment to 20.2 percent and subsequently 19 percent.

This was probably not Romania's doing alone, although its industry was interested in increased deliveries of Soviet raw materials and fuel. Gearing exports to the raw material and fuel group, and, what is more, not just in exchange for freely convertible currency, has helped our departments to plug the holes in our economy by stocking the domestic market with light industry goods and food products which are in short supply. And the long-term prospects?

In May 1986 a long-term program for the development of economic, scientific, and technical cooperation between the USSR and Romania for the period through the year 2000 was signed in Moscow at the highest level. But it took another 2 years to elaborate a plan of measures for the implementation of this long-term program. Then, the compilation of sector agreements and subprograms for production-sharing began, based on a plan from 16 USSR sector ministries and their Romanian colleagues. It is hoped that the concrete details of the long-term program will be finalized by the end of the current year, although originally it was planned to complete this work in 1988. Such is the pace of coordination.

You get the impression that as a result of poor research into the potential of the Romanian market, and also of the passiveness of the Romanian partners, the establishment of direct economic ties between Soviet and Romanian enterprises has turned into yet another short-lived campaign. A few years ago, by mutual agreement, the sides identified 63 pairs of potential partners. Six of them even managed to sign corresponding documents.

And the upshot? There is no real yield as yet. Furthermore, one such pair, the automated lines plant in Baku and an enterprise in Baranovichi, have recently rejected cooperation, because they were unable to agree on prices for Romanian goods produced as a result of production sharing which were five or six times higher than current prices in the USSR. Naturally, these prices have been affected by higher costs of raw materials and labor in Romania (Romanian workers' wages are 50-100 percent higher than those of their Soviet colleagues). Nonetheless, I believe that given a more serious approach to the establishment of direct ties, backed up by an analysis of the potential and demands of the Romanian market, it would have been possible to turn the signed agreement to mutual advantage.

It is equally difficult for the idea of joint ventures to take root. Thus a year ago Romania rejected a plan for joint production of radial tires to be based at a Romanian plant. The point is that under the Romanian Constitution fixed capital is the property of the whole people and cannot be handed over to organizations operated with foreign participation, as the Romanian press wrote. It is difficult to imagine that Soviet and Romanian organizations were unaware of this when they entered into negotiations.

For many years we spoke with pride about the 140 industrial enterprises built in Romania with Soviet technical assistance over 4 decades. However, today Romania is refusing cooperation in the construction of a number of projects. For instance, it is planning to close the gap in power generation by adding new reactors to the nuclear power station in Chernavoda (a Canadian design) instead of building a new nuclear power station based on Soviet technical documentation. The decision of the Romanian partners has been influenced not only by the accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power station but also by purely economic considerations. According to Romanian specialists, the construction of a reactor based on the Soviet design would cost 30 percent more, and fuel consumption in operating it would be 50 percent higher.

Quality remains a sore point in cooperation. This problem applies on both sides. Recently negotiations for the delivery to the Soviet Union of large-diameter pipes for the gas industry were broken off. The reason? One in three of the pipes produced in the city of Galati was defective. And who is not aware of the low quality of Romanian clothing exported to the USSR?! When it comes to cotton goods, their quality probably depends largely on the Soviet suppliers of the raw material. The point is that the share of high-grade cotton in Romanian imports from the Soviet Union has decreased from 30 to 3 percent in recent years. The question is, how can you produce quality shirts, blouses, and underwear from low-quality cotton...

There are, of course, also positive examples of economic cooperation and division of labor. For instance, the tankers and "river-sea" type vessels built to Soviet orders at Romanian shipyards are, according to Soviet specialists, superior in quality to the ships built by Bulgarian and Polish shipbuilders. The special freight-cars built by Romanian railcar builders for the transportation of grain and iron-ore pellets enjoy a good reputation. Production has started, albeit after a long delay, of the Soviet-design KA-126 helicopters at the aviation plant in Brasov. This represents a new chapter in Soviet-Romanian production sharing.

Unfortunately, there are few examples of this kind as yet. However, they do exist, and they indicate the road which we should take, assigning the raw material factor the place it deserves.

West Europe

Katushev Talks in Italy Anticipate Gorbachev Visit

LD1210145689 Moscow TASS in English 1437 GMT 12 Oct 89

[Text] Rome October 12 TASS—Soviet Minister for foreign economic relations Konstantin Katushev held negotiations with his Italian counterpart Renato Ruggiero in Rome between October 10-12.

They discussed prospects for the development of bilateral economic relations in the light of the forthcoming state visit by Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev to Italy.

During his Rome visit Katushev also had meetings with Claudio Martelli, Italian deputy prime minister, Carlo Fracanzani, minister of state participation, and leading Italian businessmen.

The minister agreed the texts of an agreement on the further development of economic, industrial and technical cooperation and a long-term programme for the development of economic, industrial and technical cooperation in the period of up to the year 2000, which are to be signed during the forthcoming visit.

The sides positively assessed prospects for transition from traditional trade to the broader use of new forms of cooperation, including the establishment of joint ventures, co-production and personnel training. They expressed the opinion that in the near future the USSR and Italy could begin works on oil production at low-profit and difficult of access deposits, reconstruction of thermal power plants, the light and food industries, car-making, participation of Italian firms in the conversion of Soviet munitions factories and in the public health system.

The ministers held a news conference on the results of the talks, during which Ruggiero pointed to the importance of developing business relations between Italy and the USSR and looking for new forms of cooperation.

In turn, the Soviet minister noted the great interest of Italian businessmen in concluding trade deals. He

pointed out that Italy has been awarded large orders for the production of consumer goods as well as machinery for the USSR, which is of great social and, consequently, political importance.

Italian Delegation Visits Moscow

LD1210162489 Moscow TASS in English 1551 GMT 12 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 12 TASS—Senior officials of the Italian Foreign Ministry led by Enzo Perlot, director-general of the ministry's political department, visited Moscow in connection with Mikhail Gorbachev's forthcoming visit to Italy.

They exchanged views on topical international issues and bilateral relations between the USSR and Italy. A working group on regional problems was set up by decision of the foreign ministers of the two countries.

The delegation head met Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Anatoliy Adamishin.

Military Observers Arrive for Turkish Exercise

LD1110110289 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0800 GMT 11 Oct 89

[Text] Istanbul, 11 Oct (TASS)—Soviet military observers have arrived to observe a planned exercise of the Turkish Armed Forces, codenamed "Mehmetcik-89." According to a statement by an official representative of the Turkish Foreign Ministry, military units and subunits totalling 18,000 men will participate in the exercise. The exercise will take place in Turkey's Thrace region in the period 11-15 October.

Finnish Commander in Chief Pays Working Visit

Yazov Meets With Valtanen

PM1310153089 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 13 Oct 89 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "Meeting at USSR Defense Ministry"]

[Text] Army General D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister, on 12 October received General J. Valtanen, commander in chief of the Finnish Defense Forces, who is in the Soviet Union on a working visit.

Questions of mutual interest were discussed in the course of the talk.

Army General M.A. Moiseyev, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff and USSR first deputy defense minister, and H. Talvitie, Finnish ambassador to the USSR, took part in the discussion.

On the same day, General J. Valtanen visited Zvezdnyy Gorodok where he saw the Yu.A. Gagarin Cosmonaut Training Center.

Valtanen Meets With General Staff

LD1310171189 Moscow TASS in English 1223 GMT 13 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 13 TASS—By TASS diplomatic correspondent:

General Jaakko Valtanen, commander-in-chief of Finnish Defence Forces, currently on an official visit to the Soviet Union, met officers of the Soviet General Staff on Thursday.

The guest said that he regarded the invitaiton to meet Soviet generals and officers as fresh proof of good relations and mutual trust between Finnish Defence Forces and the Armed Forces of the USSR. The general noted that these relations have developed into friendship, mutual understanding and trust.

Finland, Valtanen continued, pins great hopes on the Vienna talks on conventional armaments and armed forces in Europe. He expressed hope that they would produce a "balanced and more stable military situation than we have now".

"More than forty years ago our nations substituted genuine friendship for mistrust. It was a remarkable historical achievement and it is our duty to preserve and recreate it," the general said.

The Finnish guest also met leaders of ithe Soviet Armed Forces, visited the cosmonauts' town and the Gagarin cosmonauts' training centre, and talked to members of the central board of the "USSR-Finland Society".

Valtanen Departs; Moiseyev Comments

LD1310171989 Moscow TASS in English 1426 GMT 13 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 13 TASS—General Jaakko Valtanen, commander-in-chief of the Finnish Defence Forces, having paid a three-day official visit to the Soviet Union, left Moscow for home today. At the airport he was seen off by Army General Mikhail Moiseyev, chief of the Soviet General Staff, and other officials.

"The Soviet Union attaches great importance to the maintenance and consolidation of friendly, good-neighbourly relations between the peoples and armed forces of the USSR and Finland", General Moiseyev told TASS. He stressed that regular meetings of Soviet and Finnish military leaders, their talks and exchanges on key military and political problems, on bilateral relations and on contacts in the military domain contributed to the further growth of trust and mutual understanding between the USSR and Finland, and their armed forces.

General Moiseyev believes that in the nuclear era such contacts are needed to promote peace and security, cooperation and international trust.

The chief of the Soviet General Staff believes that relations of mutual understanding and respect, established between the Soviet and Finnish armed forces, will continue to develop on equitable basis in the interests of international peace and security.

"Our relations show that genuinely good-neighbourly relations can be developed not only on principles of mutual respect and non-interference in domestic affairs, but on the basis of comprehensive cooperation and international friendship, too", Army General Mikhail Moiseyev concluded.

Soviet-Norwegian Cooperation Commission Meets

PM1310115589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Oct 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Commission Session"]

[Text] The 16th session of the Soviet-Norwegian Intergovernmental Commission on Economic, Industrial, Scientific, and Technical Cooperation has been held in Moscow.

The sides examined the state of and prospects for USSR-Norwegian trade and economic, scientific, and technical cooperation. Special attention was devoted at the session to questions of increasing mutual trade, make it more stable, improving the commodity turnover structure, and developing progressive forms of cooperation. The sides discussed ways of expanding trade in machines and equipment and the possibilities for cooperation in the comprehensive use of the mineral resources of the Kola Peninsula, joint work on the Barents Sea shelf, fishing, the aluminum industry, and the development of border trade.

FRG Naval Detachment Arrives on Friendly Visit

FRG Defense Minister Comments

PM1310152889 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 13 Oct 89 First Edition p 3

[Interview with FRG Defense Minister G. Stoltenberg by APN correspondent V. Krasnokutskiy in Bonn: "G. Stoltenberg: 'This Is the Way to Confidence'"—date of interview not stated; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] As already reported, a detachment of ships from the West German Navy arrives in Leningrad 13 October on an official friendly visit. In this connection V. Krasnokutskiy, APN correspondent in Bonn, put a number of questions to the FRG defense minister at our request.

[Krasnokutskiy] Mr Minister, what significance do you attach to the visit by a detachment of ships from the FRG navy to the USSR?

[Stoltenberg] This is the first visit by our warships to the Soviet Union, or, to put it another way, the first visit to your country by regular Bundeswehr units. It was preceded by contacts at the highest political and military levels: visits to the USSR by the federal defense minister and the general inspector of the Bundeswehr. It was during this last visit that it was decided to organize a meeting between Soviet and West German servicemen. I will only welcome it if the visit to Leningrad by our ships is the start of the path to greater normalization of our relations and confidence. Personal acquaintanceship and direct conversations between servicemen in our armies could make a weighty contribution to the cause of strengthening mutual understnding.

[Krasnokutskiy] Leningrad is one of the most beautiful cities in Europe, and at the same time it is "enemy territory" on NATO maps. How far could this visit and the West German seamen's acquaintanceship with the city and its inhabitants influence the West's combat readiness? Do you not think that there is a certain contradiction between the destruction of the "enemy image" and the need to strengthen combat readiness?

[Stoltenberg] We do not have an "enemy image." Leningrad is, as you rightly observed, a city in the Soviet Union, and not "enemy territory." Furthermore Leningrad is special to me, because I was there in the sixties as federal minister for science. And I was the first minister since Konrad Adenauer to visit the Soviet Union. The city and its inhabitants made an indelible impression on me at that time. And I am sure our servicemen will be able to judge the Leningraders' hospitality. Our naval seamen are already acquainted with many countries, and are therefore, so to speak, envoys campaigning for peaceful coexistence between all peoples. The soldiers of the Bundeswehr, like Soviet servicemen, guard their country. Combat readiness is, as you said, a good thing. But readiness to act is better. We see no negative features in the policy of dialogue and detente. On the contrary, that policy is possible only on the basis of a reliable readiness for defense.

[Krasnokutskiy] The press has reported that the visit is to promote the normalization of relations between our armed forces. What do you understand by that?

[Stoltenberg] Processes which we welcome are taking place in the Soviet Union and other East European states. We are prepared to support the reforms and step up cooperation in the economic, scientific, and cultural spheres. We believe this will lead to the further normalization of relations between our peoples and states. Our armed forces and their personnel must not be left out of this process.

[Krasnokutskiy] What is the NATO leadership's reaction to the establishment of contacts between our armies?

[Stoltenberg] The NATO leadership as such does not exist. We are an alliance of 16 sovereign states in which all decisions are taken collectively. In the course of summit meetings and bilateral talks all our partners have welcomed these contacts and approved the prospects they offer.

Ships in Leningrad for First Visit

LD1310121189 Hamburg DPA in German 1020 GMT 13 Oct 89

[Excerpts] Leningrad (DPA)—A unit of the Federal Navy arrived today at the port of Leningrad for a first visit to the Soviet Union. At the invitation of the Soviet Navy, around 650 crewmen, including 150 conscripts, from the destroyer "Rommel," the frigate "Niedersachsen," and the support ship "Coburg" will carry out a comprehensive program. [passage omitted]

In addition to official meetings with representatives of the Soviet Navy in Leningrad, a visit to the Frunze higher naval school and tours of the city also are on the sailors' agenda. The people of Leningrad will have an opportunity to visit all three ships on Saturday and Sunday. [passage omitted]

Visit To 'Lay Ground' for Contacts

LD1410175989 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1039 GMT 14 Oct 89

[Excerpt] Leningrad, 14 Oct, (TASS)—TASS correspondent Aleksandr Chumakov reports:

In the very full program of visits to the Soviet Union by detachments of foreign military vessels this year, the visit now taking place in Leningrad occupies a special place. The arrival in the city of the frigate "Niedersachsen," the destroyer "Rommel," and the transport vessel "Coburg" is expected to lay the ground for the establishment of contacts between representatives of the Armed Forces of the USSR and the Federal Republic of Germany.

Hans-Rudolf Behmer, who heads the detachment of FRG ships, paid a visit to Admiral Vladimir Samoylov, commander of the Leningrad Naval Base. During their conversation a wide range of problems related to expanding contacts between members of the two countries' navies was discussed and a return to the FRG by Soviet ships, planned for next year, was also discussed. [passage omitted]

Supreme Soviet Session

Latvian Leaders Comment on Session

PM1310103389 Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 27 Sep 89 p 3

[Report by LATINFORM own correspondent S. Prokoshenko: "Session Sets Priorities]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted]

Disturbers of the Peace

It's a real mini-congress of people's deputies," someone said behind me. Indeed, looking at the participants in the meeting of the interregional deputies' group, you could see quite a few familiar faces. The working presidium included Andrey Sakharov, Boris Yeltsin, Gavriil Popov, Yuriy Afanasyev, and Viktor Palm. In general, the attitude to the group among deputies is very varied. Its participants are often accused of laying claim to the role of an opposition. I do not know about opposition, but it is time to acknowledge that it is a fully formed faction. And that should not be feared. To define the group's stance more clearly participants in the meeting spent 2 days drawing up a common platform, which I will describe in a later article. From my standpoint, the "interregionals"' stance on the nationalities question, which was given to the meeting by Andrey Sakharov and Galina Starovoytova, was interesting. The speech by Boris Yeltsin, with whom your correspondent managed to talk during a recess, did not go unremarked either. Since the "interregionals" are not so small in number—with over 350 deputies—it would be logical to keep their work within our field of attention, particularly as group members think that they are not being allowed access to readers via the press.

A Beginning

Making my way through the "filter" of engaging, stocky young men in civilian clothes, I got into the foyer of the USSR Supreme Soviet Supreme Soviet. But, unfortunately, not everyone was allowed into the Supreme Soviet Hall of Sessions. The automated equipment was not in operation the first day of the session and deputies had to vote in antiquated fashion. In the evening deputies were promised training, and the very next day.... However, let us not count our chickens, equipment is equipment, particularly ours.

...A few minutes remained before the session opened. In the unbelievable crush I spied the "tandem from Latvia"—Yan Vagris, first secretary of the republic Communist Party Central Committee, and Anatoliy Gorbunov, chairman of the Latvian Supreme Soviet Presidium. What did they expect from the session?

Vagris: We are primarily interested, of course, in the economic autonomy of the Baltic republics and, in particular, Latvia. It is necessary that this draft law be adopted.

Gorbunov: After all, there are now quite a few declarations in many spheres but no guarantees that what is planned will be carried out. This also affects the real sovereignty of the republics. Many fundamental draft laws—on ownership, local self-management, and republic economic accountability—are being submitted for discussion at today's session. We have already said at the congress that legislators should not mark time when reforms are striding forward. I think that this has been partly taken account of now. But the session is not finding final solutions to the question of amendments to the USSR Constitution, and some of its outdated provisions could impede the implementation of important economic draft laws. I therefore support those who advocate the convening of an extraordinary congress, although this does have many attendant difficulties.

Less than half an hour after our talk, the president of Latvia was forced to mount the session rostrum and remind deputies that our republic had inexplicably been "dropped" from the draft Law on the Economic Autonomy of the Baltic Republics. To see his speech I had to fight my way through a closely-packed formation of his colleagues toward one of the two (!) ancient black-and-white "Elektron" sets in the Presidium foyer. The attitude toward journalists here is surprising, to say the least. There is no radio relay from the Hall of Sessions in the building and it is virtually impossible to get basic information at the press center, let alone session documents. A single brochure on...Yugoslavia lay gathering dust on the press group's table. One journalist, who had joyfully snatched up this brochure, read the title and threw it back with disappointment, commenting "That's the last straw!"

Indeed, declaring glasnost is no guarantee that you'll get it. Let us hope that the various misunderstandings are due to first-day confusion.

Paper Reports Strike Law Debates

PM1210105289 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 11 Oct 89 p 1

[L. Nikitinskiy report: "Striking—Not Rioting"]

[Text] So in the evening of Monday 9 October what can be described without exaggeration as a historic breakthrough took place: For the first time a real parliamentary law was adopted in the country, prepared by specialists with the public's participation and undergoing a trial of strength in the course of a vote article by article, accompanied by a keen debate among deputies.

In the course of the discussion of the law "On the Procedure for Resolving Collective Labor Disputes (Conflicts)," 48 alternative amendments to the draft prepared by the working bodies were proposed. Important editorial amendments were made to the draft law. Some of the amendments, which were outside the framework of the law under review, went into the bank of ideas

at the Committee for Questions of Legislation, Legality, and Law and Order, for use in the drafting of other parliamentary decisions.

The USSR Law on the Procedure for Resolving Collective Labor Disputes (Conflicts) will be published in IZVESTIYA in the next few days. We will therefore not reiterate it, but will dwell on certain key points that prompted the stormiest debates in parliament.

In general the law is oriented toward settling disagreements that arise by peaceful means, and only the final failure of talks allows the working people to declare a strike, under a strictly defined procedure. The stoppage of work is banned for certain categories of workers and employees, and the range of demands that can be supported by a strike is restricted. These restrictions, incidentally, are entirely in accordance with generally accepted world standards.

Article 12 of the law, in particular, bans strikes "on grounds connected with demands for the forcible overthrow or change of the Soviet state and social system...." As far as we know, no one has yet put forward any such demands in the course of strikes, and if they do, some other description for it would be more appropriate.

In the course of a heated debate over Article 12, there was a convergence of viewpoints between Deputy V.I. Kirillov, who insisted, from the platform, on a total ban on all political activity at enterprises, and a group of deputies from Latvia headed by I. Bisher, which proposed a formula on banning strikes "on political grounds" not connected with the resolution of the enterprise's own problems.

The right of USSR citizens to a political strike was upheld most energetically by Deputies Alksnis and Kogan, representatives of the Baltic international movements, who already have some experience in organizing such strikes with a view to upholding the rights of the Russian-speaking minority. Here too the positions of people who usually argue with one another converged, when A.D. Sakharov stated warmly that a political strike is "the inalienable right of working people in a revolutionary period of development of society." The miners' summer strike was political in nature, A.D. Sakharov said, and it is political strikes that concern our society most today, "on both the plus side and the minus side."

However, when A.D. Sakharov specifically asked A.I. Lukyanov, who chaired the session, and N.N. Gritsenko, the main speaker on the draft law, whether the draft under discussion permits political strikes, he received no clearer answer than this: "The law is what it says." What the law says (Article 1) is that it governs only "the procedure for the resolution of collective labor disputes (conflicts) on questions of the application of existing legislation on labor and the conclusion and implementation of the terms of collecitve contracts and agreements with regard to the establishment of new socioeconomic conditions for work and life or the amendment of existing conditions...."

Deputy V.I. Samarin, who was in charge of the preparation of the draft on behalf of the Commission on Questions of Labor, Prices, and Social Policy, repeatedly and persistently pursued the thought that the area governed by the law "On the Procedure for Resolving Collective Labor Disputes (Conflicts)" is clearly defined by its title, and that it therefore has absolutely nothing to do with political strikes.

There is a legal logic in that, but the initiative for the law itself sprang out of the intensifying threat of political strikes, and it is to this that it owes the honor of being the first law of the new-style USSR Supreme Soviet. Our parliament found itself playing the part of the hunter who equips himself to hunt bear, but, realizing just in time that a bear is probably too dangerous for him, decides if worse comes to worse at least to shoot a hare. However, the question of political strikes cannot be avoided after all, it reminds us of its existence in a not very tactful way, especially since as a result of the adoption of the 9 October law it transpires that such strikes, although they are not regulated, are permitted: "Everything that is not banned, is permitted."

For all my boundless respect for Andrey Dmitriyevich Sakharov and the other deputies who uphold the right to political strikes, I will take the risk of looking into the future to express the opposite view. The political struggle should be waged without pressure or strong-arm tactics, by the methods of parliamentary debates, the election struggle, and the recall of deputies, with wide use of rallies, demonstrations, and other forms of political activeness, which, as an alternative to strikes, should not be restricted in any way except by public safety considerations.

In certain conditions a political strike can turn into outright blackmail, a kind of political racketeering, by means of which a minority, by occupying a particular key point in the economic infrastructure, can impose its will by force on the democratic majority. This is a policy of arm-twisting, and is incompatible with the principles of a rule-of-law state. No one has the right to forbid anyone to leave work, or indeed to forbid them to travel in any direction, regardless of borders, but in that case the political opposition is obliged to stake everything, without demanding the guarantees implicit in the concept of a "strike."

Great debates were prompted, both at the stage of preliminary drafting and actually at the session, by Article 11 of the law, which is intended to designate the range of production units where stopping work is not permitted as a means of resolving collective labor disputes. Strikes are banned where and when they create a threat to people's lives and health, at continuously operating production units where a stoppage involves serious or dangerous consequences, and also at enterprises in railroad and urban public transport, communications, power, and certain others, and at state organs

and organizations responsible for fulfilling tasks to ensure the country's defense capability, law and order, and security.

It is not hard to see that the list is quite wide, and could be extended still further by interpreting formulas that are not always precise. The session adopted neither the government proposals aimed at extending it, nor the amendment put forward by Deputies A.N. Krayko and S.M. Ryabchenko, who proposed to narrow the range of bans. All the same, as Deputy Krayko noted, while acknowledging the working people's right to strike, the law has immediately deprived up to one-third of all workers and employees of that right (that is the deputy's estimate). Deputy Ryabchenko expressed the fear that a too strict, discriminatory ban will not be correctly perceived by the working people, and furthermore that noncompliance with the principle of reasonable sufficiency could generate a new wave of strikes.

Article 8 of the law was adopted in a version which in effect postulates the disbandment of the strike (workers') committees that have continued to operate in the large coalfields: Their powers are to be terminated "if the sides have signed an agreement on the settlement of the conflict..."

In the course of the discussion, Deputies S.G. Lushchikov (Komi Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic) and S.I. Nevolin (Kemerovo Oblast) objected to this formulation of Article 8. Being familiar with the local situation and the miners' mood, these deputies called for a more realistic assessment of the strength and potential of the strike committees that are awaiting the law's adoption. Either they will agree to the call to "disband themselves," or they themselves, with the population's support, will decide to "disband" someone else, especially since the trade unions in their present form do not enjoy sufficient trust among the strikers. So Nevolin's amendment, which was rejected by the session, could be brought back onto the agenda by the course of events.

It is hard to give a final assessment of the 9 October law as a whole until we learn what the working people's view of it is, especially those who already have experience of the strike struggle. It contains much that makes sense, but a good deal that is unclear too. Discussing Deputy S.Ye. Savitskaya's amendment on the use of state coercion in the event of a refusal to stop an unlawful strike, the session decided that the question should be postponed pending discussion of the law "On Emergency Measures" that is to be submitted to the USSR Supreme Soviet by 1 November.

Commission Examines Health Care Provision

PM1310153189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Oct 89 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Justice, Expediency, and Ethics"]

[Text] Soviet public health must be based on these principles. This opinion was unanimously held by the members of the USSR Supreme Soviet Commission on Privileges, which examined the state of the country's medical services, at its routine session.

After careful and thorough discussion, members of the commission decided that it was necessary to preserve, for the time being, the existing territorial and departmental nature of the public health system, as changing it to a purely territorial principle would lower the level of medical services and would go against the economic reform being implemented in the country.

According to members of the commission, the task consists in preventing the level of the population's medical services, which is extremely unsatisfactory in a number of areas anyway, from being lowered, and instead, raising it to the level of better examples existing in departmental types of medical establishments. At the same time, it was declared absolutely inadmissible to redirect any part of the resources intended for general public health, toward the needs of departmental hospitals, as has often occurred in the recent past. Guided by this attitude, the commission advocated the abolition of the USSR Ministry of Health 4th Main Administration. At the same time, it was stressed that general territorial and departmental public health principles must be applied in services for patients treated there.

It was recommended that the allocation of resources be made equal for every patient in territorial and departmental medical establishments according to a common average. In addition, industrial enterprises, associations, institutes, and all-union and other organizations which have their own health care system, may finance it additionally, but only out of their own budget and under the supervision of the labor collectives. Territorial public health could be additionally financed out of the budget of local soviets according to the norms established by the supreme soviets of the republics. Pending the implementation of a practice whereby local soviets will receive contributions from all the enterprises on the given territory, the commission recommends that additional resources for 1990 be allocated out of the state budget, with the purpose of developing territorial public health. At the same time, the existing inequality in the development of the social infrastructure must be taken into account, paying particular attention to industrial and agricultural regions.

The opinion was expressed at the session that the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions could, by using its own resources, promote the development of territorial public health possible, particularly as regards facilities for pensioners.

Aiming to raise the level of medical services in territorial hospitals and polyclinics, including the reequipping, as hospitals, of administrative and other buildings belonging to various institutions, the commission recommended that a list of departmental hospitals, clinics, and polyclinics, which are able to provide efficient supervisory assistance in this matter, be confirmed.

The session of the commission spoke of the need to seriously tighten up control over the fair distribution of medical diagnostic apparatus in short supply, and its utilization. In the interests of extending medical services to various categories of the population, it was suggested that the network of (economically accountable) medical institutions where payment is required be developed further.

It was noted at the session that the extensive development of the public health system, to conform with contemporary medical and ethical requirements, presupposes a search for new forms of medical service for the population, including deductions from earnings, the creation of special insurance funds for financing the health service, and other forms which must be worked out on the basis of accumulated experience, as a result of careful analysis, discussion, and taking the opinion of all sections of the population into account.

The commission is continuing its work.

Poll Sees Supreme Soviet as 'More Businesslike'

LD1110101789 Moscow TASS in English 2012 GMT 10 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 10 TASS—The second session of the USSR Supreme Soviet is taking place in a more business-like atmosphere, the debate of the draft laws is much better argumented and critical. This assessment was shared by 57 per cent of Moscow residents during a recent telephone public opinion poll conducted by the Sociology Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

Positive shifts in the work of Soviet parliament are particularly stressed by younger people, intellectuals and members of the Soviet Communist Party.

Only ten per cent of those polled said they had noticed no positive change in the activity of the Supreme Sovet as compared with its first session last spring.

The poll revealed the great interest of Soviet people in the work of the country's legislature. More than 70 per cent of Moscow's population watch transmissions from Soviet parliament sessions daily and expect positive changes in the country's economic and social life.

The work of the Supreme Soviet is followed with special attention by industrial and office workers and students.

Commissions Discuss Election Process 11 Oct

LD1210203489 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1725 GMT 12 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow, 12 Oct (TASS)—A joint meeting of the commissions of the CPSU Central Committee for party building and cadre policy, for legal policy, and of the CPSU Central Committee Ideological Commission took place in Moscow on Wednesday. Questions of preparing for the elections to republican and local organs of government were discussed.

Vadim Medvedev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, opened the meeting with an introductory address. Georgiy Razumovskiy, candidate member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, made a statement on the matter being discussed.

During the exchange of views it was noted that the election of USSR people's deputies, which took place in the spring of this year, reflected the fundamental changes which have taken place in society's socioeconomic, political, and intellectual life, and at the same time the complexity and contradictoriness of the present-day stage of perestroyka. The voters, having resolutely supported perestroyka, spoke out in favor of its pace being intensified and of practical results being achieved more quickly. In connection with this the work of the party, local soviet, and economic bodies, and of leading cadres was assessed exigently. Such questions as interruptions in the daily supply to the population of necessities, the organization of the trade and services sphere, of urban transport, of the hygienic state of towns and villages, the insufficient struggle against thriftlessness, violations of law and order, the unresolved state of economic problems, and the sometimes scornful attitude toward cultural monuments have become politically acute.

Many party committees turned out to be unprepared to work in the new democratic situation, displayed attachment to the old approaches, showed a casual approach, and relied on automatically receiving the electorate's trust.

It is important that the proper lessons are drawn from the past election campaign, particularly as the forthcoming elections mark a major boundary in implementing the political reform so that as a result of the elections, effective soviets are formed, which will be able to really exercise their powers and will conduct matters in a new way and with initiative.

The election campaign will take place during preparations for the 28th CPSU Congress. This heightens the responsibility of party organizations which must act vigorously, relying on political methods, and they must skillfully conduct work with the electorate in the most various conditions. The decisions of the September (1989) plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, which adopted a fundamental position on the nationalities policy and on other major questions of the CPSU's work, are of great importance for the organization of election campaign work.

It was stressed that all preparatory work for the elections must be conducted openly, in a spirit of glasnost, consulting with the working people, actively drawing them into the electoral process, and that constructive cooperation must be established with all forces and act for the benefit of perestroyka. One should actively oppose attempts—whoever they may emanate from—to "pick up votes" using demagogical statements and empty promises.

The general approaches adopted by party organizations in their work should be determined by the Leninist principles of close contact between the party and the masses, and a true assessment of vital realities. But the main factor that ensures the success of this work is a real improvement in the socio-economic situation, attention to people's needs, and the satisfaction of their vital requirements. In this connection, much attention was devoted to problems demanding an immediate solution, both in the center and locally.

During the exchange of views, 16 people spoke. A summing-up of the discussion was made by V.A. Medvedev. Taking part in the work of the commissions were: V.I. Vorotnikov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet Presidium, who spoke at the session; Candidate Member of the Politburo A.I. Lukyanov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and B.K. Pugo, chairman of the party Control Committee attached to the CPSU Central Committee; and Secretaries of the CPSU Central Committee A.N. Girenko, Yu.A. Manayenkov, and G.I. Usmanov.

Commission Recommends More Funds for Railroads

LD1210164189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1547 GMT 12 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow, 12 Oct (TASS)—TASS parliamentary correspondent reports:

Soviet railroads should receive in 1990 13 percent more financial resources than is provided for by the drafts of the state plan and budget. This was the conclusion drawn by the USSR Supreme Soviet Commission for Transport, Communications and Information Technology.

Addressing a news conference here today, its Chairman Valentin Tetenov stressed that the need for additional allocations is connected with the priority significance of railroad transport for the development of the Soviet economy. The commission will convey its proposals to the Commission for Planning, Budget and Finance of the Soviet of the Union.

In the opinion of deputies, these resources ought to be directed toward the construction of new lines, the expansion of railway stations and the modernization of rolling stock. A large portion of the resources—approximately R1.3 billion, should be used for resolving the sector's social problems. The raising of tariffs on freight transportation, while keeping prices unchanged for passengers, may be a source of additional allocations.

Valentin Tetenov noted that now a serious situation has evolved in railroad transport. The insufficient quantity of rolling stock has led to 25 million people not being able to use the services of the railroad in the summer months. The quality of freight transportation has also noticeably worsened.

USSR Minister of Railways Nikolay Konarev, who was taking part in the press conference, pointed out the serious problems arising in the work of the railroad of the country as a result of the strikes and conflicts between nationalities. For instance, as a result of the strikes, there was an 18-day interval in the movement of trains in Moldavia which had a negative effect on the work of the railroads of the whole southwest of the USSR. The violation of the schedule for the movement of freight trains throughout the country has led to over 2 million tonnes of cargo now accumulating at the ports of the USSR. The minister stressed the inadmissibility of any actions directed at violating the normal work of the railroads.

Speaking of the situation on the railroads of Transcaucasia, Nikolay Konarev reported that the situation there is gradually normalizing. He noted that the improvement of the situation in the transport in this region is taking place without the bringing in of subunits of the Ministry of Defense or of additional contingents of internal troops of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs.

Legislation Committee Prepares Draft Ownership Law

LD1210203589 Moscow TASS in English 1801 GMT 12 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 12 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

Overcoming the state monopoly on ownership is the intent of a draft law discussed today by the Supreme Soviet Committee for Legislation, Law and Order.

The first reading of the draft in parliament is expected next week.

Committee Chairman Sergey Alekseyev noted that the draft, which must provide the basis for further consideration, accumulated a wealth of ideas proposed by the government, the parliamentary Economic Reform Committee and a number of research institutions.

It is a legal instrument to overcome the state monopoly on ownership, Alekseyev said. It defines, for the first time in Soviet legislation, norms of ownership by work collectives and provides for the right of citizens to own means of production necessary for individual work activity and farming.

The draft law includes provisions regulating the relationship between federal and republican ownership. Two variants are possible in this area, Alekseyev explained.

One is joint federal and republican ownership of natural resources located on republican territory. The union may own, use or dispose of these resources under agreement with the republic.

The other variant recognises natural resources as republican property and indicates in what cases they are placed at the disposal of the union.

Thus, a republic is bound to provide territory, free of charge, for the deployment of armed forces, border guards and federal offices.

Compensation may be required for the use of republican land reserves for the purposes of building transportation facilities, major pipelines, electricity transmission lines and communication networks.

The transfer of republican natural resources to the union for other purposes is done on an agreement basis.

As for land ownership, it is suggested that land may be leased for life to lease-holders and inheritors. Local councils of people's deputies must act as leasers of land for economic uses.

Later in the day, the draft law on ownership was discussed at a joint session by the parliamentary Committee for Legislation, Law and Order and other parliamentary bodies.

Commissions Discuss Cooperatives, Ownership 13 Oct

LD1310165989

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1200 GMT on 13 October broadcasts a 16-minute report on the day's proceedings in the Supreme Soviet commissions, presented by Igor Zorin.

Correspondent Olga Vasilenko reports on the session of the Commission on Issues of Labor, Prices, and Social Policy of the Soviet of the Union, which discussed the changes and additions to the draft law on cooperation. The deputies concentrated on the articles connected with the closure of cooperatives, their taxation, and relations between cooperatives and local soviets. Representatives of the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems, the Ministries of Justice and of Finances, and of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions were invited to the session and took active part in the discussion. The most acute arguments focused on the points of who has the right to close down a cooperative. The working groups proposed that the functioning of a cooperative can be suspended by court decision if the cooperation is loss-making and insolvent. A local soviet should propose the closure. But the deputies opposed this, saying that this would constitute local soviets' monopoly over cooperatives' work. The voting on this amendment resulted in 10 votes for, 10 against, and 1 abstention.

The discussion then discussed whether cooperatives should pay taxes for those employees who are employed also by enterprises and whose tax is paid by the enterprises. The working group proposed that together with disabled, pensioners, students, and mothers with many children, these people should not be taxed. However, the USSR Committee for Labor and Social Problems presented the following figures: "Of almost 3 million cooperators for 1.4 milliion employment in cooperatives is secondary." So they should be taxed. "On the whole, this amendment of the working group was not adopted," Vasilenko says.

Zorin reports that the draft law on ownership in the USSR was then discussed. At least seven variants of this draft have been submitted to the Supreme Soviet.

Academician Bogomolov, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet, expressed his view at the session of several committees in the Kremlin. In a recording Bogomolov says: "In describing the ownership we are deviating from legal terminology, which is generally accepted in the world. We are deviating from the concept of private ownership because of fully understandable ideological reasons." Bogomolov notes that foreign civic code makes a distinction between state and private ownership, which includes cooperative property, and individual proprietors. "For some reason when we are talking about private ownership we can see a rich fat man sitting on a money bag or on a factory which he owns. This is the only way in which we see this private owner." He adds that privatization in the West does not mean at all that a state enterprise is handed to one millionaire. It is frequently bought by work collectives, he says, adding: "I do not know why all—many in any case—associate it without fail with capitalism." He notes that neighboring socialist countries use this form of ownership for the benefit of socialism. He reflects on how to introduce various forms of ownership in the USSR. He notes that both Poland and Hungary have started developing joint-stock companies and to this effect they adopted a special law. Although the state is in fact the main holder, the joint-stock form of ownership is developing at the same time.

Bogomolov contrasts this with the situation in the USSR: "The law on joint-stock associations has been set aside in our country. In my view this is a very bad thing. We envisage this form of ownership here, but what is needed is to develop its mechanism, the way it will function. So it seems to me that the question of sources of property and ownership is not a question of secondary importance. It should be reflected in the law and it should not be dropped." Man was a serf under slavery and feudalism. "But in our country man must be free and this freedom should be backed by some kind of ownership independence, including by the ownership of one's own labor and this ownership and the marketing of it should be guaranteed. But why should we exclude beforehand that the ownership of land can be only in one form—in a republican form? Why is it that here the principle of diversity of ownership forms is excluded here?"

Bogmolov adds that other forms of ownership do not mean that the republic loses its jurisdiction over the property located on its territory.

Zorin says that the question of attitude toward the term "private property" and its possible negative influence upon socialist values is being hotly discussed by the Supreme Soviet.

In a recording Deputy Prunskene says the draft law on ownership will be unable to encompass on the all-union level all diversity and difference which might exist in individual republics. As for the ownership of land, she notes that this is a very controversial question, for land cannot be in joint ownership. "As for our Baltic republics, then we never handed this land over on legal basis." She says land ownership is very important for many other laws and for the laws on republican self-management and must thus be examined from many aspects. She says that there are in fact only two variants of the draft law: some deputies acknowledge the rights of the republics to their land and natural resources, while others claim that it must remain in the ownership of the whole union. She stresses the need to define the competence of the union in this respect.

In conclusion Zorin notes the crucial tasks the deputies have at this time and the nationwide interest in their debate.

Further on Cooperatives Discussion

LD1310165789 Moscow TASS in English 1641 GMT 13 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 13 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

The development of the co-op movement in the USSR has been the focus of heated debates in Soviet society recently.

Naturally the bill on changes and additions to the 1988 law on cooperation stands high on the agenda of the current session of the Soviet parliament. The issue was considered today at a meeting of the Commission on Labour, Pricing and Social Policy of the Chamber of the Union.

The boom of the co-op movement also had negative aspects stemming primarily from market imbalances. Quite a few cooperative businesses bought goods from state-owned shops and sold them to the population at a higher price.

At the beginning of the current session a group of deputies proposed to ban all trade and purchasing cooperatives. Similar demands have also been made by Soviet trade unions.

A different point of view calls for regulating the cooperative movement by economic rather than administrative methods. Its proponents, who include Vladimir Tikhonov, Andrey Sakharov and several leading economists, oppose taking prohibitive measures.

They urge the adoption of the necessary addition and amendments into the existing law as soon as possible, in order to regulate the activity of cooperatives with the help of taxing and other economic measures.

Debates during today's meeting of the Commission on Labour, Pricing and Social Policy testify to the fact that the proponents of these two positions have so far failed to reach a compromise.

Deputies Discuss Law on Socialist Enterprise

LD1310174689 Moscow TASS in English 1736 GMT 13 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 13 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

State-owned, leased, cooperative and other enterprises on the Soviet territory should have equal opportunities for effective operation, according to members of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on Economic Reform. The Committee today discussed the draft law on socialist enterprise.

The draft law was drawn up after it became clear that the law on state enterprise adopted in 1987 did not take account of new forms of economic management in the USSR.

Members of the Committee intend to analyse the draft law and proposals organisations, specifically, associations of enteprises of Leningrad and Latvia.

Deputies believe that a compromise version of the draft law, according fully with a new stage of Soviet economic reforms, should be submitted for the consideration of the Soviet parliament.

Deputies also proposed to draft a new law—The Fundamentals of Enterprise in the USSR, to determine the principles of economic activity of enterprises based on various kinds of property.

Accusations Against Gdlyan Remain Unproven

PM1510191589 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 13 Oct 89 p 1

[Unattributed "30-Second Information" report carried as part of "Seventh Microphone" feature on Supreme Soviet session proceedings]

[Text] Next week the commission to investigate the Gdlyan and Ivanov group intends to present the latest information on the progress of its work at a joint sitting of the Supreme Soviet chambers.

In view of the fact that the commission's last session listened to Tashkent Oblast Court Chairman V.I. Lipatov and other law enforcement officials, we asked N.A. Strukov to give his opinion on the validity of the charges against Gdlyan, Ivanov, and the investigators of their group regarding violations of legality and the use of unlawful methods of investigation. Deputy Strukov confirmed that the charges had been made at the session. But so far not one of them has been confirmed by evidence and there has been no legal opinion. So at the moment we cannot say that the charges are legally valid, N.A. Strukov said.

Sakharov, Others Fault System for Economic Ills

LD1510015589

[Editorial Report] Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland at 2000 GMT on 14 October broadcasts a 5-minute anonymous account of a discussion on problems of public interest discussed at the Supreme Soviet session by Deputies Gavriil Popov, Andrey Sakharov, and Vladimir Tikhonov, shown on Moscow television. Sakharov assesses the current situation in the country: The USSR has entered a difficult period in its history; the people are aware the authoritarian system is responsible for the economic crisis, social injustice, and the USSR's lagging behind the scientific and technological revolution; the authoritarian system is to blame for the ethnic conflicts and ecological disasters.

"Dr Sakharov says that the nation reminds him of a boiling pot—the most dangerous thing today would be to put a tight lid on it. Regrettably, this has nearly happened—some quarters have used the insensible ethnic voilence underway in Transcaucasia to try and persuade the parliament to impose a state of emergency in the whole country. Luckily, a more moderate resolution has been passed, but the hesitations revealed in the debate are in themselves very alarming. They reflect the country's extremely dangerous situation. By now the forces hostile to renewal have pooled their efforts and stepped up their activities. In this context the renewal must take a more radical turn."

Popov shares Sakharov's view, but has misigivings about the attitude of the national leadership:

"Dr Popov says whenever MPs [Member of Parliament] suggest that restructuring should be accelerated, they are told the situation is not that critical, but when extraordinary measures are suggested, it sounds as if the country were facing an emergency."

Tikhonov suggests that Sakharov and Popov see the situation as gloomier than it actually is seeing the main problem in the domestic consumer market and expressing disappointment that no tangible measures have been taken to stabilize the economy; economic restructuring has not yet begun.

Discussing the recent rally staged in Moscow by local trade unions, the participants agree the rally was an attempt by trade union functionaries to divert attention from their own political bankruptcy. Popov points out that the unions have made rallies part of their tactics; this will get people in habit of joining in rallies—the supporters of perestroyka must address such rallies to project their views.

Supreme Soviet Joint Session Resumes 16 Oct

LD1510174389 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1647 GMT 15 Oct 89

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet session will continue its work in the Kremlin tomorrow with a joint session of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities. The deputies will discuss items on the agenda, the examination of which was not completed at previous plenary sessions.

In addition, it is proposed to hear a report by the USSR Supreme Court and an accompanying report by the Committee on Issues of Legislation, Legality, and Law and Order, on the drafts of a number of laws.

It is possible that information from the USSR Foreign Ministry on the work to implement the main areas of the country's foreign policy will be heard.

Lukyanov Chairs Meeting

LD1610082789 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0730 GMT 16 Oct 89

[Text] Half an hour ago the autumn session of the USSR Supreme Soviet continued its work. The 4th week of joint plenary sittings has passed. Comrade Lukyanov, chairing the session today, appealed to the deputies to concentrate on the main, primary issues. They are, primarily, the legal regulation of the bases of economic reform. First of all, there is the task of adopting a package of laws on land ownership leasing, taxation, and socialist enterprises, and also the law on local self-management.

The following agenda has been proposed for today: to conclude the examination of regulating trading and purchasing cooperatives and prices for goods and services produced by cooperatives. At the moment, Comrade Sobchak, member of the Committee on Issues of Legislation, Legality and Law and Order, is speaking on this issue. Then the deputies will study a draft on the general principles of leadership of the economy and the social sphere in the union republics, and in the afternoon the deputies are planning to examine the draft law on ownership. This morning 415 members of the Supreme Soviet registered at the joint sitting.

Political & Social

Paper Reports Gorbachev Meeting With Media Chiefs

PM1310203389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Oct 89 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Meeting at CPSU Central Committee"]

[Text] A meeting with leaders of the mass media, creative unions, and ideological establishments was held at the CPSU Central Committee 13 October to examine urgent questions of the work of the press, television, and radio in consolidating all forces in society for the successful realization of the tasks of perestroyka.

M.S. Gorbachev delivered a speech at the meeting.

Members and candidate members of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretaries of the CPSU Central Committee participated in the meeting.

Kryuchkov Interviewed on Role of State Security

LD1610084789 Moscow World Service in English 0800 GMT 16 Oct 89

[Text] The chairman of the Committee for State Security, Vladimir Kryuchkov, has stated that his agency is now actively participating in building up a state ruled by law. In an interview for Radio Moscow he stressed that the security men are doing everything to prevent from ever taking place again the lawlessness of the past which brought grief and suffering to the Soviet people.

Vladimir Kryuchkov, who has recently been elected to the Political Bureau of the Soviet Communist Party, spoke against reducing the personnel of the Committee for State Security, as was being done by the Armed Forces. He said the reduction of the Armed Forces is prompted by positive changes in the world. As for security forces they should remain as they are in view of growing organized crime which is of a transnational character.

Speaking about the problem of security at home, he singled out the aggravation of differences between the different nationalities. They do not only material and economic damage, as has been the case with blockading the railway to Armenia by the Azerbaijanis. Conflicts between the different nationalities also lead to numerous casualties.

The causes of the conflicts, said Vladimir Kryuchkov, should be sought in our own home. But one can also feel the hand of the Western special services which send their men to the different Soviet republics. And in this respect he took notice of persistent radio propaganda going on.

In conclusion, Vladimir Kryuchkov stressed that in the past few years openness has become a necessity in the work of the security bodies which are gradually unravelling their secrets to the public.

Thousands Attend Rallies in Moscow, Kiev, Tashkent

Yeltsin Addresses Moscow Crowd

AU1610090089 Vienna ORF Teletext in German 0834 GMT 16 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow—Tens of thousands of Soviet citizens made use of their new liberties yesterday [15 October] and attended rallies in several cities.

In Kiev at a mass rally, the local trade union council called for a price freeze and 24 days of annual leave, Soviet television reported. In Tashkent, 20,000 people called for the Uzbek language to be made the state language in the Uzbek Republic, a Moslem activist reported. The radical reformer Yeltsin addressed 10,000 people in a Moscow stadium. He demanded the resignation of Ligachev, who tries to slow down perestroyka.

Yeltsin Publication Sells Out Maiden Issue

LD1410171789 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1554 GMT 14 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow, Oct 14 (TANJUG)—A coalition grouping of Soviet parliamentarians, led by Boris Yeltsin, has published a maiden issue of its publication named "POSITSIYA" (Position) and sold out all 50,000 copies.

The paper was issued in Estonia because the publication was banned in Moscow.

Judging by this issue, it can be said that Yeltsin really got "his own paper" since the entire front page is devoted to his visit to the United States. This was an obvious attempt to mitigate the unfavourable impression created in a section of the public of PRAVDA which carried a sensationalistic article from an Italian paper on Yeltsin's visit.

The paper writes about the founding of the "COMMITTEE OF 19" with the objective of "extending comprehensive support to Boris Yeltsin" and facilitating his activity as a deputy, including financial support.

The paper understandably made Yegor Ligachev, politburo member and secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee, the most frequent target of its attacks since he is the most influential expondent of the so-called conservative stream in the leadership.

Striking some opposition overtones, today's issue of the paper also contains reports from the Baltic republics of the kind which is impossible to find in the Moscow press.

It published a call by the Moscow party club, known as "Communists for Perestroyka," to "all party comrades" concerning the preparations for the founding conference of the "Democratic Platforem in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union." Supporters of the platform advocate political pluralism and urge a repeal of the article of the Soviet Constitution defining the leading role of the Communist Party.

Deputy Obolenskiy Says Yeltsin 'Ill'

LD1410152989 Moscow Maritime Service in Russian 0000 GMT 14 Oct 89

[From the Murmansk press review]

[Text] On the pages of NOVOSTI is a short interview with USSR people's deputy Obolenskiy. After the well-known sad events, the people of Murmansk were concerned by Yeltsin's mysterious disappearance. People telephoned various offices from the rayon committee to the oblast executive committee but they did not receive an authoritative answer. Thanks to the traditional dilatoriness of the authorities, the most (?unlikely) rumors have been circulating. Nevertheless, let us throw some light on this mystery: Where has Yeltsin disappeared to? It is very simple, Obolenskiy answered, Boris Nikolayevich has been ill.

To Resume Work After Recovering From 'Chill'

PM1510145989 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 15 Oct 89 p 1

[Unattributed report under the rubric "Dialogue: You Ask the Questions!": "Where Is Yeltsin?"]

[Text] The editorial office has received numerous telephone calls: Why was Yeltsin not at the [Supreme Soviet] session? There are rumors that someone threw him in the river....

We telephoned Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin at home. This is what he replied:

"I hear rumors almost every week: I have suffered a stroke, or I have been involved in a car crash, or even that I have been assassinated. All these are rumors, of course, nothing more. Actually, everything is okay with me. I probably caught a chill during my trip to America and have been ill. But my temperature is now down. The attending physician told me that I could start work 16 October. So I shall be taking part in the Supreme Soviet session's work on Monday."

Incidentally, let us take advantage of this opportunity to give the precise title of the Supreme Soviet commission mentioned by our newspaper 13 October. It was set up on questions arising in connection with Soviet press coverage of USSR People's Deputy B.N. Yeltsin's trip to the United States.

Vorotnikov Chairs Draft Law Discussion

LD1310191989 Moscow TASS in English 1850 GMT 13 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 13 TASS—The Russian Federation's Supreme Soviet Presidium, chaired by Vitaliy Vorotnikov, summed up the results of the popular discussion of draft laws today.

The deputies discussed changes and additions to the constitution and the election of people's deputies and local soviets.

The Supreme Soviet has received over 164,000 proposals and remarks on the organisation of central and local authorities and the formation of a socialist rule of law state.

Proposals to form a two-chamber Supreme Soviet, to broaden the republic's competence and upgrade the legal status of autonomous entities were unanimously supported by citizens, labour collectives and public organisations.

There was a positive response to the proposal not to nominate candidates from public organisations to run for people's deputies and not to hold district electoral meetings.

Many responses contain specific proposals concerning the powers of the congress of people's deputies, the Supreme Soviet and its Presidium, the soviets of autonomous regions and districts, bodies of state power and the work of electoral commissions.

The commission of legislative proposals which recruited the services of scientists and specialists, has examined all the responses, drawing up relevant amendments to 110 articles of draft laws.

The Presidium also discussed the Commission's proposals. Among other things, it discussed national representation in the deputies' corps. One can understand the position of those who, advocating the rights of an indigenous nationality of a national-territorial entity, insist that the representation be laid down legislatively.

However, it is also difficult not to agree with the other viewpoint: namely that representation must be from the people of a given territory, not from the nationality. Otherwise the electoral rights of citizens will be limited by the scope of nationality or the period of residence. And in the course of the electoral campaign everyone can agitate for a representative of local nationality.

The Presidium took note of the commission's report on the results of the popular discussion, on the changes and additions to the constitution, on elections of people's deputies and local soviets and agreed to the commissions' proposal to amend the above draft laws taking account of the popular discussion.

Politburo Examines Leadership Visits

LD1310193789 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1750 GMT 13 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow, 13 Oct (TASS)—The 12 October CPSU Central Committee Politburo session heard information from N.I. Ryzhkov on the USSR Council of Ministers' work on the drafts of the state plan for economic and social development in the USSR and the 1990 USSR state budget in connection with the discussion of them at the second USSR Supreme Soviet session. The statement noted that the USSR Supreme Soviet committees and commissions active work on these major documents makes it possible to evaluate the possible ways of strengthening those measures which are directed toward normalizing the development of the national economy more deeply and comprehensively.

It was emphasized that the main problems which have determined the priorities and approaches to the formation of the coming year's plan proceed directly from the situation which has arisen in the national economy. This is primarily the state of the consumer market, money circulation, an imbalanced production sphere because of an impermissibly large budget deficit, and a substantial reduction in putting into operation necessary and additional capacities as groundwork for the future.

The draft plan pays particular attention to urgent measures to improve the economy including reducing the

state budget deficit by half and also ensuring high growth rates in consumer goods production to satisfy the population's growing demands.

Note was made of the great importance of the work being carried out by the USSR government, the central economic bodies, ministries and departments, and union republics' councils of ministers to study and analyze proposals concerning the social reorientation of the economy, a closer balance between the population's incomes and expenditure, and the construction of housing, children's preschool establishments, and other nonproduction projects. It was stressed that the social trend of the measures which are to be implemented should really become pivotal in the development of the national economy in 1990.

Taking part in discussing the question were the first secretaries of the Communist Parties Central committees and chairmen of the union republics councils of ministers. The CPSU Central Committee Politburo took note of a report by N.I. Ryzhkov on the above mentioned question.

The meeting discussed the results of M.S. Gorbachev's trip to Berlin to take part in celebrations to mark the GDR's 40th anniversary and the results of the meetings and conversations held there. The Soviet people's solidarity with the socialist German state was reaffirmed and stress was laid on its importance for the stability of postwar Europe and for further progress along the path toward mutual understanding and cooperation on the continent. The CPSU will continue to develop all-around links with the Socialist Unity Party of Germany.

The Politburo examined and approved the results of M.S. Gorbachev's meeting with M. Rakowski, first secretary of the Polish United Workers Party [PZPR] Central Committee, who paid a working visit to the USSR. The CPSU places a high value on cooperation with the PZPR which is based on equal partnership and mutual trust; it views interparty links as an important element of Soviet-Polish cooperation. The conviction was expressed that the policy of mutually advantageous development of Soviet-Polish relations in various spheres is in the interests of the two countries and serves the cause of stability and peace in Europe.

The CPSU Central Committee Politburo listened to a report from E.A. Shevardnadze on his talks with U.S. President G. Bush and Secretary of State J. Baker on 21-23 September of this year. As a result of the Washington and Wyoming conversations on bilateral relations and current international problems, the base for further development of constructive relations between the USSR and the United States has been widened.

Of significant importance is the accord reached on holding the next official Soviet-U.S. summit in late spring or early summer of next year. The new ideas and proposals contained in the message of M.S. Gorbachev to President G. Bush have opened up a real possibility for finishing work on preparing a treaty on a 50-percent reduction in strategic and offensive weapons and also verification [kontrolnykh] protocols to the 1974 and 1976 treaties on underground nuclear explosions.

Having examined the report on the talks between E.A. Shevardnadze and President D. Ortega and other members of the Sandinista leadership during his working visit to Nicaragua, the Politburo noted with satisfaction the constructive nature of the cooperation between the USSR and Nicaragua on the international arena and for a peaceful settlement in Central America.

The Soviet side confirms its solidarity with the Nicaraguan people's struggle for independence and to be able to choose its own path of development and with its efforts ito solve the country's complicated socioeconomic problems.

The Politburo noted that E.A. Shevardnadze's convesations with F. Castro and other Cuban leaders, which took place in a spirit of comradely mutual understanding, had promoted the further coordination of positions with regard to global and regional problems including those of Central America.

A report on Ye.K. Ligachev's working visit to the GDR was examined. The importance of deepening cooperation with the GDR in the production of agricultural machines and equipment was stressed, making active use of its experience in the development of the agroindustrial complex and the socioeconomic sphere in the countryside.

The Politburo listened to D.T. Yazov's report on his visit to the United States and noted its importance for strengthening mutual understanding and increasing the stability and dynamism of Soviet-U.S. relations.

Ryzhkov Cites Goods Problems on New Program

LD1410210889 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 14 Oct 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] 'Political Rostrum' is the name of a new program that will appear beginning tomorrow on the Central Television schedule. Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, USSR Council of Ministers chairman, will speak on the first of these programs.

[Begin Ryzhkov recording] Despite the fact that a complex and grave situation concerning foreign currency is taking shape in our country—well, that is a separate topic for discussion and I do not wish to touch upon it today—we have nevertheless embarked upon allocating part of our foreign currency to the procurement of consumer goods. These decisions have already been adopted. You know with how much difficulty all this has come about and it is very intolerable that, now that goods have begun to arrive, our bad management has once again become evident.

Since the beginning of October about 25,000 tonnes of foodstuffs, several thousands tonnes of washing agents and a very great deal of other goods have not been moved out of our ports. They have not been unloaded, they have not been moved; they are in the open air, going bad. Our Czechoslovak friends had to use in their internal market 1 million pairs of footwear which they should have supplied to the Soviet Union because we were unable to transport this footwear. A lot of similar examples may be cited. Some days ago the Council of Ministers Presidium specifically examined this issue. We looked into it in detail and we gave a very serious warning to the managers of railway transport and of the sea fleet: I must state that if the situation is not corrected in the near future we will take the harshest measures against all managers, of any rank, irrespective of either their office or their position in our country, because we can no longer accept this. People simply do not understand now why this is happening, why this is happening with impunity.

In my opinion the responsibility for this situation falls in many respects upon the local administrative organs, upon the party committees for people's control. If we continue to take such an attitude toward these issues, then we will never be able properly to satiate the market and we will never be able to regulate the situation which has come about today. Therefore, very grave measures must be adopted in the localities. [end recording]

The program 'Political Rostrum', a fragment of which you have just seen, will be shown in full on Central Television's first program tomorrow at 1900 [1600 GMT].

Flaws in Current Reform Process Analyzed

PM1610094589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Oct 89 Second Edition p 3

[Article by Doctor of Economic Sciences Yu. Olsevich, sector chief at the USSR Academy of Sciences Economics Institute, under the rubric "Questions of Theory: Discussion Platform": "A Bridge Into the 21st Century"]

[Text] ***Moscow—The discussion article entitled "Toward a Modern Concept of Socialism" (PRAVDA 14, 16, and 17 July) identified "ridding society of the former vision of socialism" as an important task facing our social science. In our view, this thesis must be resolutely supported since many of our notions of socialism which prevailed during the previous 5-6 decades have clearly clashed with modern scientific and technical progress, with the tasks of ecological survival, and mainly with the fundamentally new role played by the individual in society. The elaboration of a model of socialism, a kind of bridge into the 21st century, is a paramount task of theory.***

In order to resolve this task it is necessary to ensure pluralism of approaches from the very outset, to have a broad range of alternative judgments, each one of which may contain different elements of truth. What is the methodological approach suggested by the article? Briefly and simply, its essence can be outlined as follows. Not just one but several possible models (options) of socialism are available to any given country at any given moment in time. The choice is based not only on objective prerequisites "but also on different interpretations of the aims, content, and functions of the new system by historical forces." In the late twenties our country had a choice between Lenin's model of socialism and "Stalin's model." The article describes the latter only in negative terms, without even a trace of socialism. Nonetheless, "Stalin's model" was chosen and it continued to operate during the "Brezhnev years." The choice proved to have been wrong, and it is therefore necessary to revert to Lenin's model taking into account, of course, the way conditions have changed since then.

What follows from such a presentation of the problem (whether the article's authors wish it or not)? First, there was no socialism in our country, not even deformed socialism, all those years. Second, what happened in the late twenties and early thirties was not a choice between two models of socialism but a total rejection of the socialist path of development.

It cannot be denied that these judgments contain a considerable proportion of bitter truth, they make us perceive today's perestroyka as a most profound revolutionary turnaround. But they also contain the danger of justifying a new voluntarism, of a harmful surgical treatment of society's diseased and healthy tissues alike, of an incomprehension and underestimation of positive elements in past development.

One-sided theory can be used to justify actions which lead not to the resolution but to an aggravation of the contemporary social crisis, to its transformation into a permanent one. If the existing system is entirely inconsistent, if it contains nothing but evil, then there is justification in calling for its disintegration regardless of what might emerge from its ruins—a model of "genuine socialism" or some variety of a mixed socialist-capitalist system.

But is this really so? Is the actual collocation "Stalin's model of socialism," as used in the article, legitimate? Does such usage not mean that we remain captives of old ideological stereotypes, that, instead of reinterpreting historical processes, we are doing no more than just altering their sign from positive to negative?

In our view, it is necessary to distinguish three groups of diverse but closely interwoven elements in the system (model) of social structure which prevailed in our country by the early fifties. The first concerns relations of social appropriation [prisvoyeniye] and of plan-governed production and exchange; the second concerns relations conditioned by the country's specific historical features and its international position. The result of the interaction of these groups of elements was that initially only one of the models of original, early socialism could have prevailed in the country. The low proportion of consumption and the high proportion of accumulation

in national income must be included among the distinguishing features of this model. With the ensuing widespread leveling in distribution, low level of consumption, and prevalence of state forms of public ownership.

Was it in any way possible, in those specific historical conditions, to reject the model of the original state socialism and to choose some other model? It seems to us that the only choice was between alternatives within the general framework of that specific model, bearing in mind the realities of the time.

So far we have not mentioned the third group of elements, and yet it is the one that provides the main stumbling block for most theoreticians: The elements of social relations which were introduced through mass violence. Such violence is deeply rooted in the history of Russia as a semifeudal country. It expanded on an unprecedented scale during the years of the Civil War and war communism, was only curbed somewhat in the twenties, became widespread again during the years of collectivization and dekulakization, and acquired the form of the personality cult and mass repressions which lasted until the early fifties. This mass violence left a deep mark on the socioeconomic system of original socialism and substantially deformed it. It would, however, be wrong to identify this system of violence with the actual model of original socialism.

Our press often expresses the opinion that the centralized economic system based on leveling of distribution could not have functioned without violence or terror. It is impossible to agree with this, since the diametrically opposite mechanism of management and control—the mechanism of democracy—was perfectly possible and even necessary. There are possible objections to this—it could be said that state socialism and democracy are incompatible, that democracy cannot exist without the market. It seems to us, however, that this is yet another confusion rooted in the direct reduction of politics to economics.

Broad intraparty democracy, from which we are far removed even today, functioned during the years of war communism when market relations were suppressed. In contemporary conditions, the development of political democracy in society is clearly outstripping the formation of the market. All this must be borne in mind not in order to deny the market's contemporary importance for socialism but in order to realize that, at all its past, present, and future stages of development, full-blooded socialism is unimaginable without democracy, regardless of whether it takes a market or nonmarket economic form. It also needs to be borne in mind in order not to make political democracy directly dependent on the pace and directions of economic perestroyka.

And so, the totality of antidemocratic and antisocialist deformations of the original state socialism which gave it the forms of a totalitarian structure—this is the essence of "Stalin's model" which must not be identified either with the model of original socialism or with any other model of socialism in general.

These specifically Stalinist deformations were mainly (although not completely) overcome without any special effort during the Khrushchev years. The situation is completely different as regards the totality of the infrastructure relations of the original state socialism. Having cast off the totalitarian fetters, they not only did not disintegrate (which should have been expected according to the logic of the "administrative system" concept) but were actually consolidated and gave a new push to the growth of production, and even underwent further development. Does this mean that the aforementioned model of socioeconomic relations functioned in its rational form, the form appropriate to its nature, during the Khrushchev years? No, it does not. Significant deformations were maintained, because the transition from totalitarian forms of management led not to complete and real democracy but to authoritarian forms with elements of democratism. This constituted a fundamental historical error which produced the ensuing era of stagnation.

The difficulties of perestroyka do not stem from the fact that it is difficult to get rid of deformations. They stem from the fact that we are dealing with a firmly established, mature, but no longer suitable system of socioeconomic relations.

The model of the initial, original state socialism was, by its nature, basically geared to fast extensive growth, the quantitative buildup of production potential, and the satisfaction of a relatively narrow range of needs. Original socialism had already exhausted its historical potential by the early sixties, in the new domestic and international conditions. Attempts were made to reform it. But the absence of a democratic management mechanism doomed them to failure. Matters failed to progress even as far as realizing that the task was not to cleanse the given model of deformations but to make the transition to a fundamentally different and qualitatively new model of socialism.

We feel, incidentally, that the article under discussion fails to display such a realization, with the tasks of perestroyka being reduced to the slogan of "Cleansing socialism of deformations." Admitedly the authors do speak of a "New model of socialism." But what sort of a "new model" is it? It appears that its basic facets were formulated by V.I. Lenin in the early twenties and this "new model" will soon be 70 years old.

At this point I am not going to dwell on the fact that V.I. Lenin's views of socialism are presented selectively and are therefore incomplete. The main point is that, to all intents and purposes, they are suggesting to us that we enter the 21st century with principles which were formulated, admittedly by a genius, but nonetheless on the basis of experience of a historical era which is now past. Moreover, these principles are outlined so vaguely that, in their totality, they do not describe any historical model.

Of course, a single article cannot be expected to produce an answer which the development of our entire social science should produce. At the same time, however, there must be no self-delusion that, just by recalling a few of Lenin's general principles of socialism, it might be possible to describe a special model which would meet the conditions of the early 21st century.

Far be it from me to claim that I am suggesting such a model. But I am prepared to list a series of thoughts.

First, the forms of ownership and the forms of appropriation of means of production ought to match the realities of the second stage of large-scale machine industry (infraindustry), which is distinguished primarily by the presence of an all-embracing, flexible, and differentiated machine system. Capitalism has responded to this development by closely interweaving the numerous forms and functions of ownership—ranging from state and transnational corporation ownership to ownership by small farmers and rentiers.

Socialism will be in a position to make efficient use of modern productive forces only if it creates a direct organizational and financial link, and not just a market link, between all forms and elements of ownership, and society is able to manage them flexibly on the basis of uniform criteria. In this process, the leasing of publicly-owned means of production to self-managing labor collectives will ensure a foundation for the functioning of the market mechanism.

Second, the new model of socialism presupposes complete subordination of the entire economy to the social sphere. The entire management of production ought to proceed from social programs, and all chains of economic ties must ultimately end at organizations serving the population directly and must be comprehensively dependent upon them. This applies to economically accountable market links, as well as to the planning and management of the economy.

The central criterion in the social sphere itself must be a requirement to improve people's entire way of life and get rid of the threat of ecological-technological disaster. This requirement involves much more than just "greening"—the new model of socialism must be geared toward an ecological-revolutionary turnaround in means of production and way of life.

Third, the new model of socialism is incompatible with the old demand for nothing more than "working people's participation in management." Such participation is already provided by trade unions in the West, and this is clearly insufficient.

A real revolution is also taking place in the quality and structure of the individual, with human values undergoing a radical change. "Human capital" is becoming the main driving force of progress. The new socialism will not be new unless it means full management by the people—of society as a whole and of all its economic components (through democratically elected soviets of people's deputies functioning in conditions of glasnost, through labor collectives and other organizations in conditions of their complete democratization, through referendums and polls).

The new model of socialism which we are now striving to reveal cannot be the ideal, either. Once implemented and having advanced social interest, it will also become outdated in a few decades' time and will need to be replaced. Therefore, it would be extremely dangerous if now we were to start laying the methodological foundations of a future stagnation by giving the impression that the new model represents genuine socialism as opposed to all other models. History does not recognize immutable socioeconomic models, even within the framework of one and the same mode of production. V.I. Lenin spoke of stages of socialism's maturity, and by now it ought to be obvious that every stage will have its own corresponding model. To continue. A model cannot be reduced to a sum total of socioeconomic principles, because it also involves the mode of production at a qualitatively distinct historical stage, it involves a specific unity of productive forces and relations of production, and it moreover involves also a certain type of reproduction.

The present difficult situation in which economic perestroyka finds itself is largely determined by insufficient understanding of the aforementioned aspects of the models of socialism, as well as by practical mistakes caused by underestimating them.

And another point. If a "model of socialism" means an unbreakable unity of social relations and material flows, then the transition to a new model presupposes without fail a simultaneous change in these relations and the proportions of reproduction. But (and this has been repeatedly pointed out by some economists) the proportions and rates planned for the 12th 5-Year Plan turned out to be in sharp contradiction with the economic reform; they were stubbornly defended for a long time and began to be amended only in 1989, following the emergence of acute imbalances.

This detachment of economic relations from the state of the material base gives rise to another mistake, originally enshrined in the Law on the State Enterprise. In the conditions of far-reaching imbalances in the economy and specifically of shortages of raw and other materials, the law should not have been uniformly applied to different sectors of the economy. Thus, whereas the raw material sectors need a mechanism stimulating primarily the boosting of labor productivity and return on capital, for the processing sectors paramount importance is attached to savings of raw materials and the quality of output.

The neglect of links between the reform of economic relations and material proportions also resulted in disruptions to the natural progression of the reform's implementation. The reform, which was calculated to intensify material incentives, should have begun with the

sectors producing the output to provide such incentives. As this output accumulated, the reform could have spread to the remaining sectors. But the provision of "incentives" involving a fivefold increase in the state budget deficit whipped up overt inflation, created a tremendous potential for "suppressed" inflation, and brought the entire consumer market to the brink of collapse.

If we correctly perceive the nature and mechanism of the model we have to transcend and of the model we have to create anew, we should be able to build a "model for the transition" from the former to the latter. All we have for the time being are elements of a concept of this transition, uncoordinated and contradicting each other. This means that the quest—a quest on a profoundly scientific basis—must continue.

Law Regulating Labor Disputes Published

PM1310185189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Oct 89 First Edition pp 1-2

["USSR Law on the Procedure for Resolving Collective Labor Disputes (Conflicts)"—PRAVDA headline]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet resolves:

Article 1. This law governs the procedure for resolving collective labor disputes (conflicts) relating to questions of the application of existing labor legislation and the conclusion and execution of the conditions of collective contracts and agreements in the sphere of establishing new or changing existing socioeconomic conditions of work and everyday life between labor collectives (subdivisions' collectives) and the management of an enterprise, establishment, or organization or sectoral (intersectoral) organs of management.

Article 2. The labor collective's demands relating to the questions indicated in Article 1 of this law are shaped and approved at a general meeting (conference) by a majority of votes by the collective's members. The meeting is considered competent [pravomochnyy] if it is attended by at least three-fourths of the collective's members (conference delegates).

Demands are sent to the enterprise, establishment, or organization management not later than 3 days after being approved. Demands are set forth in writing.

The labor collective's interests are represented by an organ empowered by it (trade union committee, labor collective council, or others).

The enterprise, establishment, or organization management is obliged to examine them within 3 days of receiving them and to report its decision without delay. If it is outside the competence of the enterprise, establishment, or organization management to resolve the labor collective's demands, it is obliged to forward them to the appropriate organ for examination within the same time. The decisions adopted must be set forth in writing and reported to the whole labor collective.

The management and the trade union committee must inform the local soviets and higher economic and trade union organs of every instance of a collective labor dispute (conflict) without delay.

Article 3. A labor collective's demands which have been rejected or only partly met by the organs to which they were sent are to be examined:
a) by conciliation commissions;
b) by labor arbitration boards.

Article 4. Conciliation commissions are set up with equal numbers of the sides' representatives. Collective labor disputes (conflicts) are examined within 5 days. The commissions consult with labor collectives, the management, local soviets, and higher economic, trade union, and other interested organs and are obliged to utilize all the possibilities at their disposal to settle the collective labor dispute (conflict) which has arisen.

The commission's decision is adopted by agreement between the sides on the basis of negotiations, is made official by a protocol, and has binding force on the sides.

If agreement is not reached in the conciliation commission or its decision is not carried out, the sides have the right to turn to a labor arbitration board.

Article 5. A labor arbitration board is created by the parties to the collective labor dispute (conflict).

The labor arbitration board includes people's deputies and representatives of a higher trade union organ and of the organ dealing with labor and social questions.

The labor arbitration board's size and personnel for each conflict are established by agreement between the sides.

The labor arbitration board chairman is approved by agreement between the sides from among the members of the given labor arbitration board.

The labor arbitration board will examine collective labor disputes (conflict) with the obligatory participation of the sides' representatives and, where necessary, higher organs' representatives.

The labor arbitration board must adopt a decision within 7 days of receiving the application.

Execution of the labor arbitration board's decision is mandatory.

The labor arbitration board has the right to make a special representation to higher economic and trade union organs in respect of the officials whose fault it was that the collective labor dispute (conflict) arose. The higher economic and trade union organs report to the labor collective the results of the examination of this representation.

Article 6. The sides and the conciliation organs are obliged to utilize all possibilities to eliminate the causes and the circumstances leading to the collective labor dispute (conflict).

If the conciliation commission and labor arbitration board have been unable to settle the sides' differences, the reasons for this are reported in writing to the labor collective. In this case the labor collective has the right to use all other means provided for by law to satisfy its demands, even including the complete or partial suspension of the work of the enterprise, establishment, organization, or subdivision (a strike).

Article 7. A strike is an extreme measure to resolve a collective labor dispute (conflict). The decision to strike is adopted at a meeting (conference) of the labor collective or subdivision collective by secret ballot and is considered adopted if at least two-thirds of the members of that collective (conference delegates) vote for it. The strike is headed by a trade union committee, labor collective council, strike committee, or other organ empowered by the labor collective.

The management must be given written, advance notice of the start of a strike and of its possible duration at least 5 days in advance.

The management notifies suppliers and customers, transport organizations, and also other interested enterprises, establishments, and organizations of the possibility of an upcoming strike without delay.

No one can be forced to participate in or to refuse to participate in a strike.

Article 8. The organ heading the strike operates within the limits of the rights provided for by legislation and by this law, represents the labor collective's interests during the strike, and informs the population via the mass media of the progress in resolving the collective labor dispute (conflict) which has arisen. These powers cease if the sides have signed an agreement to settle the collective labor dispute (conflict) which has arisen, as well as in the event of the strike's being deemed illegal.

When exercising its powers, the organ heading the strike does not have the right to adopt decisions within the competence of the enterprise management, organs of state power and management, or public organizations either.

The fulfillment of the conditions of the agreement worked out in the course of resolving a collective labor dispute (conflict) is monitored in accordance with legislation by trade union organs, by organs of the labor collective and of public organizations, and by higher organs of state power and management.

If the conditions of the agreement are not fulfilled, the organ which headed the strike has its powers reinstated.

Article 9. The USSR Supreme Soviet or a union republic Supreme Soviet may postpone the holding of a strike or suspend it for up to 2 months.

In the period between sessions of USSR Supreme Soviet, a union republic Supreme Soviet, or the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium or, correspondingly, the union republic Supreme Soviet Presidium has the right to adopt a decision to postpone or suspend a strike for the said time, with an obligatory invitation going to USSR people's deputies from the corresponding territories to attend the Presidium session.

Article 10. The enterprise management, the local soviet executive committee, the labor collective involved in the strike, and the organ heading the strike are obliged to take the necessary measures to ensure the enterprise's viability and the safety of state and public property and to observe socialist legality and public order.

Article 11. The cessation of work as a means of resolving a collective labor dispute (conflict) is not permitted if this creates a threat to people's life and health, nor in enterprises and organizations of railroad and urban public transport (including the subway), civil aviation, communications, power generation, defense sectors (in subdivisions directly engaged in producing defense output), in state organs, enterprises, or organizations entrusted with fulfilling tasks of ensuring defense capability, law and order, or the country's security, or in continuous production processes whose suspension entails serious and dangerous consequences.

After complying with the conciliation procedure provided for in this law, the labor collectives of the said enterprises and organizations have the right to turn for protection of their legitimate rights and interests to the union republic Supreme Soviet or, if the enterprise has union status, to the USSR Supreme Soviet, which must examine their demands and give an answer within 1 month.

Article 12. The following strikes are deemed illegal and are not permitted:

a) Those connected with the advancement of demands for the violent overthrow or alteration of the Soviet state and social system, as well as demands entailing violations of national and racial equality of rights;

b) Those announced without complying with the provisions of Articles 2, 3, and 4 of this law and those which begin or continue in violation of the requirements of Articles 5, 7, 9, and 11 of this law.

The decision to deem a strike illegal on the grounds indicated in this article is adopted by the supreme courts of union republics (those which are not divided up into oblasts) and autonomous republics or by kray and oblast (city) courts following an application from the enterprise management, higher economic organ, or local soviet executive committee and is reported to labor collectives through the organ directing the strike and via the mass media.

A decision to deem a strike illegal obliges labor collectives to end it and begin work no later than the day after a copy of the decision is handed to the organ heading the strike.

Article 13. Working people participating in a strike in accordance with this law keep their overall and continuous work record and the right to provision under state social insurance, while working people participating in strikes not banned by Article 12 of this law also keep their place of work (position).

Working people participating in a strike lose their wages for its duration.

For the purpose of giving material assistance to strikers, the labor collective has the right to create a fund from voluntary contributions and donations, as well as a special reserve fund in accordance with the collective contract (agreement).

The enterprise, establishment, or organization is obliged to maintain the wages of working people who did not participate in the strike but who were unable to carry out their work because of it, within limits not below those set by Article 43 of the Fundamentals of USSR and Union Republic Labor Legislation, as well as for idle time which is not the working person's fault.

Article 14. Organizing or participating in a strike deemed illegal by a court is regarded as a violation of labor discipline and can entail the application of the measures of disciplinary punishment and material liability provided for in Articles 49 and 56 of the Fundamentals of USSR and Union Republic Labor Legislation.

Leaders and other officials to blame for the emergence of collective labor disputes (conflicts) or for delaying the execution of the decisions of a conciliation commission or labor arbitration board are called to disciplinary account, up to and including dismissal, and, in the event of their actions having caused material harm, also to material account to the tune of up to 3 months' salary.

Article 15. Harm caused to other enterprises, establishments, organizations, or citizens as the result of a strike is compensated for in accordance with existing legislation.

[Signed] M. Gorbachev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet.
Moscow, the Kremlin, 9 October 1989.

Armenian Supreme Soviet Plans 15, 21 Oct Sessions

NC1510080989 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1700 GMT 14 Oct 89

[Announcement addressed to the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet Deputies]

[Text] The 10th extraordinary session of the 11th convocation of the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet will take place on October 15, 1989 at 1500 at the Republic's Supreme Soviet Hall.

The 21 October session will also meet.

(?Address) Melik Adamayan Street.

[Signed] The Presidium of the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet.

Supreme Soviet To Meet 21 Oct

NC1410090989 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0200 GMT 14 Oct 89

[Announcement addressed to the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet Deputies]

[Text] The 10th extraordinary session of the 11th convocation of the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet will take place on October 21, 1989 at 1000 at the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet hall on Melik Adamyan Street [word indistinct].

[Signed] The Presidium of the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet.

Parliament Convenes 15 Oct

NC1610071389 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1900 GMT 15 Oct

[Text] The 10th extraordinary session of the 11th convocation of the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet continues its work today.

Two topics have been placed on the agenda: 1) the tragic incident that took place on 10 October in Stepanakert; and 2) the Armenian deputies' activities at the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Dear compatriots, we will provide greater detail in later bulletins.

Yerevan Receives Fuel, Construction Materials

NC1410112189 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 13 Oct 89

[Text] Yesterday 13 Azerbaijan railway trains made up of 583 railcars came in from Norashen Station. Their cargo consists of 204 railcars carrying production commodities, prefabricated houses, construction material, and cement. For the first time, 17 tanks of gasoline were also received. At Idzhevan Station, 7 trains with 371 railcars came in, while 16 trains with 439 railcars arrived in Armenia on the Transcaucasus line. From Georgia, 67 railcars for the disaster areas have arrived, as have 134 railcars carrying prefabricated houses, cement, and construction material. Seventy-eight tanks of petroleum products have arrived in [name indistinct]. For the first time in the past 2 months, petroleum products have come in from Azerbaijan, even though it should be pointed out that more than 40 trains carrying fuel are standing in depots near Norashen Station and that very few railcars carrying provisions are being received.

Leaders Thank Georgians for Assistance

NC1310125289 Yerevan KHORHRDAYIN HAYASTAN in Armenian 0545 GMT 13 Oct

[Text] The Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, the Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the Council of Ministers have sent a cable to the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee, the Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the Council of Ministers which says:

In the difficult days for Armenia and the difficult economic situation resulting from the earthquake and which was exacerbated because of the blockade of the automobile and railway routes through Azerbaijan, we once again felt the valuable fraternal assistance from the Georgian people. Thanks to your republic's railway and other transportation workers on the rail route through Georgia and the doubling of its capacity, this route became truly vital to us. Today, your people have shown their respect for eternal laws, their love toward mankind, and their principles of friendship and fraternity.

Konarev Outlines Rail Traffic Problems

PM1410190989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Report on interview with USSR Minister of Railways N. Konarev by correspondent R. Ignatyev: "To Organize Train Traffic"—no place or date of interview given; first paragraph is introduction]

[Text] There are 192 trains with sundry freight shipments waiting in line to make their way to the Transcaucasus republics. This is the situation on the region's railroads today. Here is what IZVESTIYA's correspondent was told by USSR Minister of Railways N. Konarev:

Train traffic along the Azerbaijan Railroad is, on the whole, moving. But train reception at a number of station junctions could be boosted. The situation is serious between Beyuk-Kyasik and Norashen junctions. The reason is the failure of the Transcaucasus Railroad and the Yerevan Section to dispatch cars. We must take urgent measures to normalize the situation....

Up to 500 cars arriving at their destination on time have not been unloaded every day in Armenia over the last few days. Similar losses are occurring also along the Tbilisi Section in Georgia.

Train traffic to Nagorno-Karabakh and to Armenia via Idzhevan Station is still delayed on the Azerbaijan Railroad. The railroad needs assistance from the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic leadership. Deliveries of petroleum products to Stepanakert are still a problem. Not a single tanker car with gasoline, diesel fuel, or fuel oil has arrived there recently. This results in equipment lying idle and in delayed unloading of cars. Only 20 cars with sundry freight arrived in Stepanakert 13 October. Extremists obstruct the movement of trains carrying liquid freight. They climb onto the tracks and block the trains' movement....

The Azerbaijan Railroad is also failing to meet targets for the onward movement of trains arriving from the North Caucasus Railroad through Samur Junction.

In short, resolute measures by local authorities are needed to normalize the situation. Naturally, it will also take time to bring train traffic back on schedule.

Azerbaijani, Armenian Law Enforcement Organs Meet

PM1410190189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Own correspondent A. Dzhalilov report: "Meeting Between Representatives of the Two Republics"]

[Text] Baku—A meeting between representatives of the two republics' law enforcement organs was held at the point where Lachinskiy and Gorisskiy Rayons meet, on Azerbaijan's border with Armenia. It was also attended by the first secretaries of the party rayon committees. A unanimous opinion was expressed that any further exacerbation of tension could lead to new tragic calamities, and that it is necessary to take decisive and immediate measures to prevent them.

"The meeting was certainly timely and useful," A. Rafiyev, Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] deputy minister of Internal Affairs, who headed the Azerbaijan delegation, told IZVESTIYA's correspondent. "We agreed to coordinate efforts in order to prevent armed clashes and other provocative actions by criminal elements, and to rigorously take to task those who set the peoples of Armenia and Azerbaijan against one another and keep people in a permanent state of fear. We also touched on questions of lifting the blockade on highways and imposing law and order on the railroads. Jointly with R. Aslanyan, chief of the Armenian SSR Ministry of Internal Affairs Political Department, we proposed to continue the practice of similar meetings at all levels, and also to step up efforts by elders in neighboring villages and settlements, to seek together with them ways out of critical situations should they develop, to embark on coordinated sensible actions, and to promote trust between the two peoples."

Proposals Made for Armenian Economic Independence

NC1310155789 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0200 GMT 13 Oct 89

[Text] On the instructions of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee and Council of Ministers, scientific experts of the republic, under Academician Butanyan, director of the Economic Institute of the Armenian Academy of Sciences; Gevorgyan, director of the Economic and Planning Institute of the Armenian State Planning Organization; and Movsisyan, lecturer at the Yerevan State University, have drawn up three options for the economic independence of the Armenian Republic. The

three proposals were discussed during a meeting held at the Committee for the Improvement of the Economic Mechanism attached to the Armenian Council of Ministers. Prominent economists and scientists, directors of ministries, departments, and major enterprises, and representatives of the public were present.

The proposals encompassed a broad spectrum of ways and means to achieve the economic independence of the republic. The necessary conditions for the realization of this independence were delineated. They ranged from permitting various forms of private property to empowering the republic to provide independent solutions to foreign economic relations and to organize and administer the activities of the free economic zones on its own territory .

Serious criticisms were made of all three options. It was indicated that the proposals did not fully take into account the economic and national characteristics of the republic and the problems pertaining to the elimination of the consequences of the earthquake, and that enough attention had not been paid to the strengthening of the cooperatives in the republic. It was advised that particular attention should be paid to the consolidation of economic ties with diaspora Armenians. It was pointed out that the final option must form the basis for the creation of a national plan for the revival of the Armenian Republic.

It was decided to draw up a final draft version on the economic independence of the Armenian Republic as soon as possible and submit it for popular examination.

Mkrtchyan, deputy chairman of the Armenian Council of Ministers and chairman of the State Planning Committee, summarized the results of the meeting. The following took part in the meeting: Serobyan, secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee and chairman of the Socioeconomic Affairs Committee of the Central Committee, and Arutyunyan, chairman of the Socioeconomic Department of the Central Committee.

Moldavian Working People's Union Holds Congress

LD1410174389 Moscow TASS in English 1728 GMT 14 Oct 89

[Text] Kishinev October 14 TASS—A constituent congress of a new public organisation—a Moldavian Working People's Union—was held in the City of Bindery, one of the republic's leading industrial centres (the USSR's southwest) today.

It was attended by delegates from 120 major industrial and agricultural enterprises, scientific institutions and design organisations of Kishinev, Tisaspol, Bindey, Rybnetsa, Beltsy, Komrat and other towns and districts.

The following main goals of the new alliance based on the unity of the work collective councils have been proclaimed: to uphold the vital interests of the working people, to promote the Soviet Communist Party efforts to effect political and economic reforms in Soviet society, to build a rule-of-law state and to broaden democratisation and glasnost.

The congress's resolutions and documents adopted as a basis for the platform of its activities set out the following principles: to transfer full power to the soviets (councils) of peoples deputies, to accelerate perestroyka through immediate granting of real independence to enterprises, the pluralism of the forms of property, work against inflation, deficit and the shadow economy.

The documents also point out the need to ensure a de-facto social equality of citizens irrespective of nationality, language, the place of residence; a democratic solution to the problems of revival and development of national cultures, renunciation of violence and of any forms of intolerence, and the strictest responsibility for stirring up interethnic strife.

A considerable part of the demands was put forward by many directions of the socio-economic activities of the union, and a charter.

It also considered the question of organising its own publication and discussed proposals on changes in the Moldavian draft law on elections.

Ukraine Officials End Discussion on Language Law

LD1310180189 Moscow TASS in English 1739 GMT 13 Oct 89

[Text] Kiev October 13 TASS—By TASS correspondent Viktor Demidenko:

Permanent commissions of the Ukraine's Supreme Soviet today summed up the results of the public discussion of the draft law on languages.

A group of deputies of the Ukrainian parliament, researchers of the National Academy of Sciences, writers, workers of government bodies, workers in the arts, jurists and representatives of public organisations worked for seven months on the draft law, Vladimir Shinkaruk, head of the draft working group, told TASS. Their purpose was to ensure that the draft law reflected the interests of the 50 million people in the Ukraine.

"The published draft was broadly discussed in work collectives, in various localities, at higher educational establishments and by public organisations," Shinkaruk said.

"The group received some 30,000 proposals and remarks and two alternative drafts. They have all been analysed and summed up.

"The main purpose was to work out legislative provisions that would give the Ukrainian language the status of official language. The fact that the Ukraine is a multi-ethnic republic was also taken into consideration.

"In addition to Ukrainians, it is inhabited by eleven million Russians, 600,000 Jews, 400,000 Belorussians,

300,000 Moldavians, 260,000 Poles, 240,000 Bulgarians, 170,000 Hungarians, 100,000 Romanians, 100,000 Greeks, 50,000 Crimean Tatars....

"Therefore the draft law does not dwell on the Ukrainian language alone. It takes into consideration the proposals for free development of all national languages in the republic.

This is a manifestation of respect for all the peoples inhabiting the Ukraine. As to the Russian language, there were numerous proposals of citizens that it should remain the language of interethnic communication of Soviet peoples," Shinkaruk said.

The participants in the meeting endorsed the draft law. the remarks and suggestions will be taken into consideration when drawing up its final version. It will then be referred to a regular session of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet.

Demonstration for Uniate Church in Lvov Reported

18001670 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 19 Sep 89 p 1

[S. Romanyuk report: "What Happened in Lvov?"]

[Text] Fifty years ago Soviet troops moved into the territory of the Western Ukraine. That day brought happiness and bitterness to the people. Happiness because the centuries-old dream of Western and Eastern Ukrainians to live in aa a single family had come true. Bitterness because the Stalinist terror engulfed the liberated lands and thousands of innocent people were thrown into prisons and sent to the camps.

On Saturday there was to be a citywide meeting in Lvov, announced by the Council of War Veterans and Veterans of Labor. The meeting took place but the tone was not set by the veterans. The organizers were supplanted by representatives of the People's Rukh of the Ukraine, and the red flags over the square were lost among the yellow-and-blue banners. But this was only a prelude.

Sunday morning brought an unprecedented activity to the city. In response to a call from the officially unregistered council for the defense of the Ukrainian Catholic Church, thousands of people filled the streets. At noon a religion service started on the square alongside the premises of the oblast party committee.

A few comments on the history of this issue. The Ukrainian Catholic Church was founded in 1596. In 1946 it was officially disbanded. However, religion services were held illegally. Since August 1987 the Catholics have regarded themselves as "coming out from underground." Since that time there have also been collections of signatures in defense of the Ukrainian Catholic Church.

On 17 September those attending the church service adopted an appeal to the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, M.S. Gorbachev, and to the Pope in Rome, calling for the legalization of the the Catholic Church in the Ukraine.

By evening events had moved to the central street of the city—Lenin Avenue. People joined hands and surrounded the avenue in a double ring. At 2000 hours, on the orders of the organizers, this living chain was lit up with thousands of burning candles. An oppressive silence reigned in the city center.

At 2200 hours, responding to an appeal from the regional council of the People's Rukh of the Ukraine, lights were extinguished in the windows of many of Lvov's inhabitants and candles were lit on window sills. With this ritual a far from simple day for the inhabitants of Lvov came to an end and the deep autumn night fell.

Lvov Mayor Interviewed on Informals' Actions

PM1510145189 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 15 Oct 89 p 1

["Topical Interview" with B.D. Kotik, chairman of Lvov City Soviet Executive Committee, by correspondent S. Romanyuk: "What Is Happening in Lvov?"—no place or date of interview given]

[Text] [Romanyuk] Bogdan Dmitriyevich, you are the mayor of Lvov, one of the country's most original cities. Visitors have always admired its architecture and history. Nowadays, however, most of them are concerned with different issues. A few days ago I received a telephone call from a rather alarmed comrade in Moscow who asked me: "What am I to do, I have a tourist travel voucher, but you seem to be in a state..." How do you appraise the situation in the city, especially in the wake of the 1 October incident [clash between police and demonstrators]?

[Kotik] I have my own views, but I am reluctant to anticipate events. A reply to this question will be provided by the objective investigation now being carried out by three commissions in parallel—a deputies' commission, a public commission, and a Prosecutor's Office commission.

I would like to say something else. No matter how events developed on that tragic day, the outcome is extremely bitter. Dozens of people were hurt. There was terror and despair in people's eyes. All this did happen. The culprits must be punished.

Whereas the situation in the city prior to 1 October was, on the whole, in line with the democratic processes now under way in the country, today it is complicated in the extreme.

[Romanyuk] Do you mean possible actions by the Lvov strike committee?

[Kotik] Above all else.

[Romanyuk] Let us first of all tell readers that this organization came into being right after the aforementioned events and has a ramified network of strike formations at local level. Its influence can be judged by the 2-hour warning strike in Lvov on 8 October. The strike committee recently adopted an ultimatum containing some very serious demands of a political nature. The committee gives warning of a citywide strike if these demands are not met. As far as I know, representatives of the Ukrainian Helsinki Union are at the helm of the strike committee. This organization is inclined toward opposition to the existing state power. Does it wish to exploit the present situation to attain political goals?

[Kotik] A debatable question. As regards the labor collectives' response to the strike committee's calls, I know what it is: People are perturbed by what happened. They want to know the truth.

But it must not be forgotten that strikes could have disastrous consequences for the city. Any work stoppage at this time of total shortages could considerably aggravate the situation as regards the supply of basic necessities to the population.

[Romanyuk] Bogdan Dmitriyevich, you must agree that the 1 October events followed their own logic. There has not been a single week in the recent past without picketing of state buildings and institutions, unauthorized rallies and marches have become more frequent, and soapbox oration is rampant. As a matter of fact, one of their slogans is: "Either Strikes, or Life on Bended Knee." Informal organizations with extremely radical leanings are trying to gain the initiative. How come party and soviet organs are letting it slip out of their hands?

[Kotik] There are many reasons for this. This is what I think. If some actions by an organ of power are not backed by one-fifth, one-third, or one-half of the population, it would be logical to ask: "Are they correct in essence?" If we are to assume that the people exist merely to suit the authorities' purposes, then it would not have been worth while embarking on perestroyka at all. But if the authorities exist to suit the people's purposes, then the people's will must be the will of the authorities. Alas, beliefs to the contrary have not yet been consigned to oblivion...

The question of building a monument to T.G. Shevchenko in the city was quite legitimately raised more than a year ago. The idea originated from the people. Indecision reigned in official circles. When the "OK" came from above, some informals twisted matters so as to give the impression that this decision had been made only thanks to their efforts, thus attracting support from thousands of citizens. This episode can be considered the start of the present confrontation. Matters developed from that point. A linguistic debate was launched in the city. The slogan "State Status for the Ukrainian Language" was another one that we did not raise. It was ardently welcomed among the indigenous population. Once again, we pretended that the problem did not exist. Moreover, individual party and soviet officials did all they could to obstruct the creation of primary organizations of the "T.G. Shevchenko Ukrainian Language Society" at enterprises. Only a year passed, and a draft law on the language was submitted for discussion, admitting that the language spoken by the people in their millions needs state protection. We closed our eyes to the initial steps taken by the cultural-ecological "Lion Society," which is badly needed by our city, and did our best not to recognize "Memorial" and "Student Fraternity." They came into being nevertheless, but it is not we who determine policy.

I would like to especially mention the People's Movement for Perestroyka. Preconditions for the emergence of "Rukh" were created a year ago, and even an action group was in existence. Party and Communist Youth League officials actively participated in its initial work. We could have organized a mighty organization in support of party policy and could have significantly accelerated democratic processes in society. It was not to be. Until just recently Communists were forbidden to cooperate with "Rukh," some people even muttered about party membership being incompatible with participation in the work of this organization, which is highly influential among the people. Is it any wonder that now it is not we who play first fiddle in "Rukh"?

[Romanyuk] Bogdan Dmitriyevich, the political situation in Lvov became especially tense this fall. The 50th anniversary of the day when Soviet troops entered the territory of west Ukraine fell on 17 September. We are approaching 26 October, which will be the 50th anniversary of the People's Assembly which adopted the decision on reunification with the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. What do you think in this context?

[Kotik] I have no intention of considering 17 September a holiday. The "Molotov-Ribbentrop" pact was implemented simultaneously with the Red Army's entry in the west Ukraine's territory. Essentially, that marked Europe's division into spheres of influence, and the negative echo of the manipulations of peoples' destinies can still be heard to this day. But that day marked the de facto unification of Ukrainian lands. The subsequent People's Assembly legalized it juridically. The dream of eastern and western Ukrainians to live together materialized. This is a holiday for the entire Ukrainian people. And I cannot understand why the republican authorities have no plans to widely celebrate the jubilee 50th anniversary of reunification in the republic's capital, the city of Kiev.

[Romanyuk] But we must agree that the situation in the city is complex. Elections to local soviets are just around the corner. A complex situation is expected to develop during the election campaign. Not only Communists but also informals place great hopes on its outcome....

[Kotik] Let's be frank: The informals make no secret of the fact that they intend to struggle for power along the path of parliamentary democracy. They say this at rallies

and announce it in their press organs. I believe that this is a normal phenomenon. After all, the CPSU has deliberately given up the easy political life, correctly assuming that a vanguard role ought to be won not through political exhortations or slogans but through specific and real deeds. If we do not wish to suffocate in the atmosphere of stagnation, we need a healthy opposition. And it already exists.

People might ask: Are we Communists not afraid of being defeated in the election campaign? Let me say that we are not. Our party is a serious organized force. We have already learned to admit our mistakes. The time has come to correct them. And if some functionary, used to believing himself to be "the mind, honor, and conscience of our era," fails to hold onto his seat, let him get used to this idea: He could not have been brilliant in terms of mind, honor, or conscience....

People's Deputy Wants Crimean AES Stopped

90UN0031A Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 15 Sep 89 p 1

[Inquiry by USSR People's Deputy, First Secretary of the Crimean Oblast CPSU Committee A. Girenko to Deputy Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers L.D. Ryabev: "When Will They Stop Building the Crimean AES?"]

[Text] Dear Lev Dmitriyevich!

For 2.5 years now, the public in our oblast has been seriously troubled by the continuing construction of the Crimean AES [Nuclear Power Station]. Communists and non-party members, workers and collective farmers, representatives of the creative arts intellectuals, retirees—the entire population of the Crimea resolutely demands that the leadership of the oblast take vigorous measures to stop its construction.

The Crimea is an all-union resort area. This region, unique from the standpoint of climate, history, and culture, this highly seismic and ecologically particularly vulnerable zone demands a special approach in this matter.

The decision of the commission (led by Academician Ye.P. Velikhov) on specifying the seismic characteristics of the area of construction of the Crimean AES (dated 28 February of this year) says: "At present, the magnitude of the strongest possible earthquake in this area, which for the AES site comes to 9 points on category 2 land, should be accepted as the maximum earthquake for AES calculations."

Despite this authoritative conclusion, the decision was made to engage in additional studies of the seismic threat in the zone.

The decision of the Bureau for the Fuel and Energy Complex of the USSR Council of Ministers to bring in foreign specialists for the additional study of seismic and geological conditions caused the protest of the public which saw this act as mistrust of the conclusions of Soviet scientists and of their competence.

In April of this year, a session of the Crimean Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies resolved to suspend the construction of the AES and to change the facility into a training center, taking into account the unique natural environment of the Crimea, its status as an all-union resort area, as well as the conclusions of the commission headed by Vice President of the USSR Academy of Sciences Ye.P. Velikhov which has acknowledged the critical level of seismic threat in the area of the site of the future AES.

However, the people are justifiably concerned by the fact that, despite the decision made, construction is in progress and tremendous funds are being expended—and all of this against the backdrop of well-known economic and financial difficulties which our country is facing. The 1989 plan alone envisages utilizing 20 million rubles for construction work. This protracted lack of certainty with regard to the Crimean AES is considerably complicating the situation in the collectives of construction and operating crew personnel of the station which is not easy to begin with.

These issues are particularly pressing at present, in the course of the campaign of elections to the republic and local organs of power which has begun. Sociopolitical tension is being fueled on the account of the construction project. Along with the operation of organized protest forces, meetings have been started, picketing and other spontaneous actions have occurred. Leaders of individual independent groups intend to organize a warning all-Crimea strike in order to protest the construction of the AES.

When you, Lev Dmitriyevich, visited the site of the Crimean AES under construction, you had a chance to become convinced personally how real the complex situation is which has developed at the construction site and around it. The instruction of the USSR Minatomenergoprom [Ministry of the Atomic Power Industry], the USSR Minenergo [Ministry of Power and Electrification], and the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers to perform within 1 month (i.e., before the middle of August of this year) a comparative technical and economic analysis of the variants of the future of the AES, including mothballing its construction site, was the result of your visit. This instruction also envisaged creating a training center using the facilities of the nuclear power station which would be equipped with a full-scale simulator for training operating and repair cadres for the facilities of the nuclear power industry, using the buildings and facilities of the AES for building a power station on conventional fuel or for creating ecologically clean manufacturing of products for the national economy by utilizing them.

Unfortunately, thus far neither the leadership of the oblast nor the public of the Crimea have become aware of the fate of this decision.

In light of the above, I ask you to respond to the inquiry: When will the decision be made to discontinue the construction and change the function of the Crimean AES?

Respectfully,
[Signed] A. Girenko, USSR People's Deputy, First Secretary of the Crimean Oblast CPSU Committee

Protest at Building of Tatar AES Gains Support

LD0710110189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0230 GMT 6 Oct 89

[Text] A protest march by representatives of the autonomous republic's public against the construction of the Tatar nuclear power station [AES] lasted 3 days. The march set off near the walls of Kazan University, passed through Neberezhnyye Chelny, and ended at the AES construction site at Kamskiye Polyany. The point is that the construction of the AES is in progress in the region of the confluence of the Kama and Volga, in a constellation of industrial giants, and in a zone of active tectonic faults. Scientists believe that the area's geological and ecological conditions are totally inappropriate for the construction of the AES. In their view, even as insignificant accident at the AES would turn into a tragedy for the entire central and lower Volga.

The voice of the public is calling on the leaders and the USSR Ministry of Atomic Power to listen to the alarming predictions of science and is being vigorously supported by the party bodies and government of the autonomous republic. Nevertheless, the union ministry is stubbornly insisting on its departmental positions.

Orchestrated Pro-Nuclear Campaign Challenged

PM1610111989 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 12 Oct 89 Second Edition p 2

[O. Plakhotnikova report: "Argument Without Opponents. Notes From International 'Roundtable' at USSR Nuclear Society"]

[Text] Having been invited to the international "roundtable" session devoted to the problem of radioactive waste, I was sincerely pleased about this happy combination of circumstances whereby my professional duties as a journalist allowed me to satisfy my own purely human curiosity. Are there ways of making the storage of deadly substances safe? How do specialists themselves react to the flagrant fact that our country accepts waste from other states? I imagined there would be a highly interesting discussion, a clash of opinions, and a committed debate about unusual new ideas...

Now the meeting, held under the auspices of the USSR Nuclear Society, had started. It was attended by Academician Ye. Velikhov, president of the society; V. Asmolov, chief of the Safety of Nuclear Power Department at the Kurchatov Nuclear Power Institute; A. Gagarinskiy, deputy director of this institute and also executive secretary of the Nuclear Society; and other Soviet specialists. The deputation of American colleagues—a group of specialists on nuclear waste headed by Doctor D. Ross—was no less impressive. Japanese journalists were present too.

V. Asmolov, who spoke at the very start, devoted the thrust of his speech not so much to radioactive waste—as announced in the program—as to the merits of nuclear power. He was followed by Ye. Velikhov, but he too simply restricted himself to listing arguments in favor of nuclear power. He was then vigorously supported by the next speaker...

Yes, we need not mention the different arguments. There are many of them. Energy saving will apparently not solve the problem—that is the first point. Installations using free solar and wind power are incapable of supplying the power requirements of one-sixth of the earth's surface—that is the second point. Third, the problems associated with coal-fired power stations are far more serious than the problems of nuclear power... Usually such categorical statements would arouse fierce objections from opponents, but in fact there was nobody to argue with at the Nuclear Society: Whether owing to an organizational muddle or some other reason the meeting organizers had forgotten to invite any opponents...

The discussion turned to the subject that had prompted the gathering. Academician Ye. Velikhov reported that assessments of the dangers posed by radioactive waste had been "considerably exaggerated" (the subtext of this was clearly that the "roundtable" might not have been held). The president of the Nuclear Society noted in his speech that whereas the method of dispersal in the environment is used for most toxic substances, protection against radioactive waste is based on a completely different principle. Namely, the principle of centralized and controllable burial....

Despite my respect for this prestigious assembly I was nonetheless unable to understand why the debate only came to life when they discussed how to convince people that nuclear power is safe.

Incidentally, I can understand why specialists are worried about the question of how to control public opinion, which has now become a material force and the last obstacle in the way of the universal spread of nuclear power. That is why the specialists have to enter the hitherto unknown sphere for them of social psychology, which can indeed offer tried and tested ways of manipulating mass opinion. They may even be achieving some success in this area: Just as in the years before Chernobyl, the regions are now once again starting to fight for the right to have a nuclear power station located in their area, while people in polluted areas who today, to use Professor Knizhnikov's expression, are "scared to death and choked by each piece of bread or drop of water," will feel completely happy. But who will gain from this?

I read with mixed feelings in the journal ATOMNAYA ENERGIYA that the recently formed USSR Nuclear

Society (incidentally, its members include leading specialists in this sphere and a good hundred enterprises and organizations) is "designed to galvanize collaboration between specialists and the public on issues linked with the use of nuclear power and to promote the spread of objective information on nuclear power." Unfortunately, one got no sense of this at the meeting.

Events of recent years have clearly showed what happens when there is a monopoly on the truth. Unfortunately, nuclear power, a sphere of heightened risk, is still a monopoly today. The dispute between nuclear power workers and the public, which has a semblance of objectivity, is unfortunately a blind alley, since it is conducted in different languages and on a different scale. All the specialists' calculations and figures are often disregarded: After Chernobyl people are dubious about any argument. On the other hand, as soon as anyone capable of arguing seriously against nuclear power is found (and there are precious few "nonspecialists" of this sort) they are immediately accused of incompetence. It isn't hard to guess who will win this argument.

Yet the damage done to the country's development by the nuclear monopoly can already be assessed. For instance, whenever it is suggested that renewable solar, wind, or tidal power be utilized, the nuclear power lobby usually replies politely that for the time being things are too complicated. Yet in California alone there are more than 15,000 operational wind machines, whose total capacity approximates to one and a half nuclear power stations, while the cost of the energy can compete with large hydroelectric or nuclear power stations. This is quite apart from the ecological attractions of the alternative route. Ideas associated with energy saving are being ignored no less successfully. The energy-intensiveness of production has been reduced 33 percent by the Americans, and 78 percent (!) by the Japanese. What about us? It is as if the demon of nuclearization has confused the country. We must build! We only have to convince the people...

This can only be done in one way: by guaranteeing that nuclear power stations are safe. And although neither the Nuclear Energy Institute nor the Nuclear Society are as yet taking responsibility for issuing guarantees, it seems that super-serious arguments will soon be used in the arguments with the public. "Absolute safety is impossible in principle," V. Asmolov stated at the session. "But, starting from some level, we can talk about guarantees to the people, since the likelihood of an accident will be very small and insignificant."

How is this manipulation of likelihood to be assessed? Some people may be pacified by talk about one accident in 100,000 or even a million years. But what do we see in reality? There have been three major nuclear catastrophes in the past 30 years: at Windscale (Britain) in 1957, at Three Mile Island in 1979, and at Chernobyl in 1986. In addition, there have been eight major incidents at nuclear power stations involving reactor explosions, core meltdown, and damage to containment structures: Santa Susana (United States) in 1959, Idaho Falls (United States) in 1961, Detroit (United States) in 1966, St. Laurent (France) in 1969, Wuergassen (FRG) in 1974, Brown Ferry (United States) in 1975, Oyster Creek (United States) in 1979, and Ginna (United States) in 1982. Dangerous incidents at nuclear power stations in our country have recently been publicized, too. Life itself refutes speculative calculations.

The problems of nuclear power generation can be viewed from various standpoints. Most often profoundly technical and rational points are discussed: Will it explode or won't it, is it advantageous or not? Here too the specialists are fantastically and incomparably stronger than those for whom they are trying to do a "nuclear" favor. Just what are the moral aspects of the argument? An attempt to look into these aspects also makes us realize that real writers who continue to be the yardstick of our conscience are for some reason in no rush to join the supporters of nuclear power stations.

Thus: None of the specialists deny the possibility of another Chernobyl, yet the construction of nuclear power stations continues. Public reaction is usually unambiguous—it protests at such construction. And this reaction is by no means as irrational as it sounds. It is probably superfluous to talk about the difference between a voluntary risk and an imposed risk. Many people freely put if not their lives then their health at risk by indulging in skiing, hang-gliding, or motor racing. These hobbies would not be so attractive if they did not have a pungent whiff of danger. The freedom to take risks is an inalienable part of individual freedom, and whether you want to exercise that freedom or not is up to you, as they say. Coercing others to take risks (and to all intents and purposes this happens during the construction of reactors) is, if you will forgive me, nothing more than an infringement of individual freedom.

We are all well aware that nuclear power stations are an objective reality and that they will not disappear by magic today or tomorrow. But does this really mean that the arguments about nuclear power are over once and for all? I am sure that the supporters of nuclear power stations do have something to say to their opponents. And the better-argued the debate is, the more that nuclear power itself and society as a whole will benefit.

Lithuanian Communist Party Plenum Ends 13 Oct

LD1610131889 Vilnius in English to North America 2300 GMT 13 Oct 89

[Text] [First Announcer] Next you will hear a commentary by Edvinas Butkus on the plenum of the Lithuanian Communist Party's Central Committee:

[Butkus] The plenum of the Lithuanian Communist Party's Central Committee that ended its work today has decided to convene a party congress on 19 December this year and endorse a program allowing to pursue the party's main objective—independence.

Perhaps no one today would commit himself to defining a degree of independence. A 33-strong committee to make preparations for a congress has been set up. Although the congress items on the party program of the Lithuanian Communist Party and on the status of the Lithuanian Communist Party were singled out as separate, an action program of the Lithuanian Communist Party has been given priority. It is supposed to look for ways and means to deal with the negative tendencies in the economy, to stabilize the political situation and strengthen the role of the Lithuanian Communist Party on Lithuania's social scene.

The congress will hear an account of the party's auditing committee and elect the governing bodies. Two important issues—to convene a congress or a conference and the degree of representation, one delegate from 200, or 100, or 50 Communists—were put to vote. The primary party organizations who proposed the extent of representation say that a congress held in this way would be most democratic.

Well, as far as the procedure of delegates' election is concerned, it is to be mixed and therefore fairly free.

The first secretary of the Central Committee, Algirdas Brazauskas, made a concluding speech. The forthcoming congress will legalize democratic developments of our society, he said. We have embarked on the road of independent Lithuania. Much has been accomplished but there is a great deal to be done in future. Economic self-dependence, said Algirdas Brazauskas, got stuck today. [as heard]

In its congress the Lithuanian Communist Party will legalize its independence, but the role of the party is no less important. Economic instability weighs heavily on the party. I hold other political forces in high esteem, said Algirdas Brazauskas but only we are a real force to cope with the task. Scope for activity is wide as never before and there is not a single area in which Moscow would interfere. We practically no longer feel the hand of the center, though from a juridical point of view we are still subordinate to it. Therefore the congress will have to define not only the status but also the ways in which to maintain relations with the center. Representation in Moscow should be accompanied by a considerable degree of freedom for our actions.

In general, Algirdas Brazauskas has called to take a serious view on changes taking place outside Lithuania. Take for example plans to establish an independent Communist Party of Russia, which fact would automatically transform the Soviet Communist Party into a Union of Republic communist parties. Besides, a new Soviet Communist Party program and its rules are in blueprint stage. Algirdas Brazauskas believes that they will be fairly radical.

He concluded his well-worded 20 minute long speech with a call to meet the forthcoming party congress being united, honorable and creative.

Party Congress Scheduled for 19 Dec

LD1410153589 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 14 Oct 89

[Text] We have already reported that the Lithuanian Communist Party [LCP] Central Committee plenum in Vilnius has ended. It considered the results of the discussion on radical restructuring of the LCP's activities and the convening of the 20th congress. The plenum decided to convene the LCP congress on 19 December 1989. It will hear a report by the republican Communist Party Central Committee on the progress of restructuring and on the program of immediate measures to overcome negative tendencies in the economy, to stabilize the political situation, and to enhance the role of the Communist Party in the public life of Lithuania.

Comrade Brazauskas, first secretary of the republican Communist Party Central Committee, made a speech summing up the results of the plenum.

Lithuanian Party's Leadership Style Criticized

PM1310140189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Oct 89 Second Edition p 2

[Article by Ch. Vysotskiy, second secretary of Shalchininskiy Lithuanian Communist Party Rayon Committee, under the "Party Life: Discussion Platform" rubric: "View From the Rayon"]

[Excerpts] I met Pranas Yelenskas, secretary of the farm party organization, in the machine shops at the "Lenino Presakay" Collective Farm. This party organization enjoys great authority within the collective and is full of initiative, and all the Communists are production frontrunners. The secretary got in before me with his own question:

"What is your attitude to the debate announced within the Lithuanian Communist Party? Which party will you be in at the end of the debate?"

The formulation of the question did not surprise me at all because it fully reflected the thrust of the discussion "On the Status of the Lithuanian Communist Party" under way in the republic. Although I replied that I would still be in the Lithuanian Communist Party as a component part of the CPSU, our discussion did not end there. The topic was too serious not to listen to my interlocutor's viewpoint and not to share my thoughts and even argue.

Like most Communists, I am deeply worried by the situation that has taken shape within the party. However, I do not deem it correct to reduce everything to talk of its declining prestige. I can see plenty of demagoguery in such talk, because simply, it is greatly to the advantage of many people. First, to those people who want to obtain power. Second, to those bureaucratic party functionaries who have themselves lost prestige among people and are thus "saving face": The party is to blame, they declare. Therefore we have far more need today of

a specific program for emerging from the current situation than of picking at old sores.

The CPSU platform "The Party's Nationalities Policy in Contemporary Conditions," adopted by the CPSU Central Committee September Plenum, was precisely this kind of program. But the main task lies ahead, namely the implementation and practical realization of the ideas enshrined in the platform. In our republic this program must be backed up by initiative and creativity from the three main leadership links—the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau, the party rayon committee [raykom] bureau, and the primary party organization committee or bureau. In my view, the republic party organization has hitherto lacked clear unity of action and mutual understanding in all these links, and this is taking its toll on the mood, activeness, and stance of rank-and-file Communists. When we speak about autonomy for raykoms and primary party organizations, that certainly must not mean: Stew in your own juice. Throughout the party's existence, grassroots and leading links were guided by a common strategy.

There is considerable evidence to show that the republic party organization has lacked a united plan of action for a long time. I am above all referring to the 17th Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum, which discussed the prevailing sociopolitical situation in the republic. There was a clear and well founded report and sober and well conceived speeches, and a good action program was elaborated for all the republic's Communists. But the ink had not had time to dry on the documents before the designated positions began to be abandoned. Publicly adopted decisions were quietly pushed into the shadows, and this had a painful impact on people's sentiments.

Here is another example: A decision of another Central Committee plenum announced a debate among Communists about what the republic's party should be like and began the elaboration of a Lithuanian Communist Party Program and Statutes. Yet elaborating our own program and statutes distinct from the CPSU Program and Statutes in effect signifies a deviation from CPSU unity. The debate is being conducted within the framework of the republic party organization and is discussing what the Lithuanian Communist Party should be like rather than what the CPSU should be like. The decision on the question of the status of the Lithuanian Communist Party in this situation may very well be like the decision adopted on the Lithuanian Leninist Communist Youth League [Komsomol], which has withdrawn from the All-Union Komsomol.

I also have to mention another aspect of the problem. The party debate is being carried out in the context of forming new "republic-center" relations. But at the same time virtually nothing is being done to define new, democratic relations between the rayons and the republic. A great deal that is outmoded, stagnant, and unjust remains here. Is it the case that we require democratization of the "upper echelons," but diktat suits us perfectly well in the "grassroots"? [passage omitted]

Many people are alarmed by the situation whereby there is no guarantee of the freedom to use the Russian and Polish languages in our international Shalchininskiy Rayon, where more than 80 percent of the inhabitants are Poles, 8.5 percent are Lithuanians, and 5 percent are Russians and representatives of other nationalities. At present there is no higher educational establishment [VUZ] in the republic for the Polish population, although approximately 270,000 Poles live in the Vilnius area. Incidentally, such a VUZ could also provide specialist training for other republics' Polish residents.

It is annoying that republic television, radio, and newspapers frequently present a one-sided and biased account of the work of party organizations, Communists, war and labor veterans, and the Army. I have spoken on this question three times at various forums in the republic, but there is no change in the situation.

I am sure that the fuss over the nationalities question will soon die down. But that does not mean that we should wait idly for "better times." It is the duty of party organizations to implement a principled political line. The main task now is not to divide people on the basis of nationality but, on the contrary, to unite them.

There is another question that concerns me. Monitoring of decisions has slackened at all levels. You get the impression that we now set greater store by someone who is a fluent and interesting talker than someone who works honestly. We are beginning to forget the good old principle: "If you don't agree, object; if you object, make a suggestion; and if you make a suggestion, act on it."

Primary party organizations are prevented from fully exercising their vanguard role by the lack of comprehensive studies of models for their activity. High-ranking party organs lead primary party organizations from the standpoint of the old slogan: The party is responsible for everything. At local level this slogan gives rise to a lack of system in the work of party organizations and is the prime cause of supplanting of the functions of economic bodies and public organizations. The lack of scientific recommendations means that primary organizations seek ways to master the art of political leadership by means of trial and error. On the other hand, the duplication of economic and public organs belittles the party organization's significance as the political vanguard.

Without the party's prestige and its role as the guiding and organizing force in our society—this was said on several occasions at the CPSU Central Committee September Plenum—we cannot count on success in any collective, rayon, or republic, or within the country. From this viewpoint, the CPSU Statutes certainly need additions. The sections about primary, rayon, city, okrug, oblast, kray, and republic organizations must define clearly not only their duties but also their rights both within the activity of the party as a whole and in

resolving local questions. Clearly, the CPSU Statutes must have a special section on "Union Republic Party Organizations" and define the rights and duties of the aforementioned party formations as the political nucleus of the working people within the USSR's union republics.

Questions relating to the formation and work of leading organs and the structure, size, and material support of the apparatus must all be resolved by party organizations themselves on the basis of general party directives and local conditions. Republic organizations must also be given more even representation within leading party organs. For instance, the leaders of republic central committees could be included within the Politburo. Or another option: A council of the first secretaries of the republic party organizations' central committees could be set up under the CPSU Central Committee Politburo.

The CPSU's task is to unite the communist parties in all 15 Soviet socialist republics on an equal basis, irrespective of the number of Communists there. Its program must set out the strategic aims, while the statutes must define the status of the union republics' parties without putting them on the same footing as CPSU kray or oblast committees.

In short, we must not lose our ideological and international unity. Today as never before, we need a strong—and only a strong—party.

Human Rights Action Group Set Up in Lithuania

LD1410004189 Vilnius in English to North America 2300 GMT 13 Oct 89

[Text] An action group to defend human rights has been set up in Lithuania. Twenty members of the group, most of them being well-known personalities in Lithuania, political figures, scientists and writers, as well as the former political prisoner, (Viktoras Patkus), have released a declaration speaking up for active public control in order to grant equal rights for all the citizens of Lithuania in every sphere of life. With this aim in view the group hopes to unite all the public forces in Lithuania that have been engaged in this activity up to now, including the Lithuanian Helsinki Group, the Sajudis human rights group, and others which pursued this noble task during the years of the anti-democratic clampdown. The action group intends to expend its activity along constitutional parliamentary lines.

Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Statement on Situation

PM1310104389 Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian 26 Sep 89 p 1

["Statement by Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet on Political Situation in Republic"—SOVETSKAYA LITVA headline]

[Text] The statement by the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet "On the Political Situation in the Republic," adopted after amendment by the editorial commission formed at the session, is published below. The original version of the statement was published in the newspapers SOVETSKAYA LITVA and CZERWONY SZTANDAR for 24 September this year.

The perestroyka process in the republic is marked by a variety of important, deeply meaningful events. The public's vigorous participation in solving the problems worrying the country, the republic, and all its cities, rayons, and settlements is helping the growth of people's political self-awareness and inspiring them to new actions. In the process of the creation of a democratic law-based state, the expansion of glasnost, and the formation of a tolerant attitude toward differing opinions on various questions of our life, the objective historical truth is being restored, the past is being interpreted anew, and landmarks for the future are being mapped out. Today it is already quite plain that the path of perestroyka, the renewal of socialism, democracy, and glasnost is the path establishing the priority of common human values, leading to republics' sovereignty, and determining their free development and responsibility for their own fate.

The first steps to implement the political, social, and economic reforms, and the possibility of implementing the republic's economic independence inspire in people the hope that our society will be radically renewed and that it will be extricated from the crisis.

We realize that the processes taking place in the republic are indissolubly linked with the changes taking place throughout the country. Our society's course of development is the USSR's further democratization, the improvement of interethnic relations, and the Soviet Union's radical transformation on the basis of legal principles. These aims are also outlined by the CPSU Central Committee, which ratified the principles of the party's nationalities policy at its plenum.

The Supreme Soviet deputies realize how serious is their responsibility for Lithuania's fate. Any assessments and decisions must be deeply thought out and considered. Therefore, while taking into account the CPSU Central Committee's concern about the political situation in Lithuania and the other Baltic republics, at the same time we do not approve of the categorical tone of its statement and unsubstantiated assessments.

The Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet is moving toward genuine statehood by constitutional means and is adopting laws and resolutions reflecting the opinion of most of the republic's inhabitants.

But the decisions of the organs of state power, the diversity of opinions, and political pluralism are frequently accompanied by categorical demands and actions. Conservative forces hostile to perestroyka in Lithuania are trying to hinder or distort it. Striving to implement destructive aims, they declare the processes taking place in the republic to be discrimination against national minorities, an undermining of the foundations

of Soviet power, and a violation of human rights. Various committees and organizations lapse into extremes in putting forward their demands to the organs of power, threaten to go on strike, and present ultimatums. In some rayons national-territorial formations not provided for by the law are being proclaimed.

The union mass media do not always objectively report the situation in the republic, thus forming an incorrect attitude to Lithuania's rebirth, misleading the public, and increasing tension.

In addition to this, there are forces in the republic which question socialism's potential, make insulting attacks on the Soviet Army, and accuse the organs of power and management of sluggishness, although this is due to the absence of real opportunities.

The Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet states that the aims of such actions are to destabilize the situation, to artificially stratify Lithuania's population according to nationality, to stir up strife and distrust among people, and to show a desire to sow doubt as to our determination to create a sovereign, socialist, and genuinely democratic state.

It is time for everyone to realize that today no one needs futile emotions and ambitions and unrealistic demands and threats, for they not only hold us back, but also wreck everything we have achieved. Each of us must clearly grasp what harms everyone—Lithuanians, Poles, Russians, and other nationalities living in Lithuania. Lithuania is united and indivisible, it is the home of all the people who have been living here from time immemorial, so our present and future lie in their hands.

Through democratic and legal measures the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet will continue to consistently seek to restore Lithuania's statehood and sovereignty, to create the most favorable conditions for productive labor, and to ensure a prosperous life for all its people. We firmly believe that common sense and joint efforts aimed at the good of Lithuania and all its inhabitants will prevail.

In the name of these aims we call on all people of good will, public organizations and movements, labor collectives, and local soviets to consolidate their forces and not to yield to the rousing of national hostility. Only restraint, dialogue, accord and cohesion, specific actions, and the real results of perestroyka will guarantee success on the road of progress. "O Lithuania, you live only by your unity!"
Vilnius, 23 September 1989.

Akhromeyev Attends Riga Liberation Day Fete

PM1310153289 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 13 Oct 89 First Edition p 1

[Lieutenant Colonel M. Ziyeminsh report: "City Day"]

[Text] Baltic Military District—On 13 October the working people of Soviet Latvia and its capital are marking the 45th anniversary of liberation from the fascist German occupiers. The previous day, a Riga City Day was held. There were meetings and ceremonies to honor those who liberated the Latvian land from the Hitlerites, and festive shows.

Marshal of the Soviet Union S. Akhromeyev took part in the celebrations. It was here in Latvia that he greeted the Great Patriotic War; he was in the ranks of the heroic defenders of Liyepaya.

At a scientific and practical conference devoted to the commemorative date, the marshal delibered a report on Soviet defensive doctrine and the present stage of development of the USSR Armed Forces. There were working meetings at the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee and meetings with the leadership of the Latvian People's Front and members of the republican council of the International Front of Working People of the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic.

Latvia's Vagris Answers Voters' Questions

PM1310125189 Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 24 Sep 89 p 1

[Report by LATINFORM own correspondent Ye. Kovalenko: "Getting Down to the Nitty-Gritty"]

[Text] On Friday 22 September, at the end of the workweek, the inhabitants of Riga's Proletarskiy Rayon went to the party rayon committee office to meet with Ya.Ya. Vagris, their USSR people's deputy and first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee.

"Before leaving for the second session of the USSR Supreme Soviet," the deputy said to the assembly, "I considered it essential to meet with you, my electorate. I think that you will have accumulated lots of questions since the Congress of USSR People's Deputies. The 12th session of the Latvian Supreme Soviet, a Latvian Communist Party Central Committee plenum, and a CPSU Central Committee plenum have been held, so let us try together to clear up any uncertainties that there may be."

"Party and Soviet organs have recently been encouraging the collection of signatures for all manner of appeals," was how one question began. And the impression given is that decisions are made on the strength of the number of signatories. The assumption being that the opinion supported by the majority is right. "This seems a very simplistic approach to me," Ya.Ya. Vagris replied. "Responsible decisions are never adopted mechanically. Everything is far more complex. We have to listen to every viewpoint and find the optimum solution."

As people know, the Latvian National Independence Movement chose the method of signature collection in order to set up citizens' committees. The deputy's opinion on this question was of interest to many. "The Latvian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau and the republic Supreme Soviet Presidium," Ya.Ya.

Vagris said, "have given their assessment of this phenomenon. The actual creation of citizens' committees is not punishable under criminal law. However, it is important that their activity be legal. If it is anticonstitutional, measures will be taken."

The attitude of our republic party leader to another sociopolitical organization—the Latvian People's Front [LPF]—will become more clearly defined, in his opinion, after the 2d LPF Congress. "At the moment," Ya.Ya. Vagris observed, "I am perplexed by its draft program. But it is only a draft at the moment. It was created by a group of people. And it does not express the will of the whole movement. Let us see what form the document takes at the LPF congress. Comparing it with the Latvian Communist Party action program, one can say that there is quite a large number of common provisions in them. However, I categorically reject the LPF draft program's tenet that Latvia should develop outside the USSR."

This opinion of Ya.Ya. Vagris' produced the following question from one of those present: "Why is your attitude toward the LPF warmer than your attitude toward the Interfront?" To which the deputy replied: "I personally have no objections to the International Front as a movement; however, there are objections to its leaders. Today," the deputy continued, "like it or not, we should conduct a dialogue and avoid a peremptory tone. The only way to find a solution to our difficult problems is by working together."

One would have thought the answer was clear, but it was followed by this question: What measures will the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee take to consolidate the LPF and the Interfront? "The effectiveness of such measures from above is poor today," the deputy answered. "A rapprochement of standpoints on questions of perestroyka is taking place little by little. But there is no productive dialogue 'above.' It certainly should be started up in primary and rayon party organizations. Wherever people work together and are in contact. This will perhaps yield greater benefit."

After all, all programs or statements should be drawn up together. Otherwise you hear the following opinion expressed: Our family refuses to subscribe to PRAVDA and IZVESTIYA. We cannot subscribe to publications which published the unjust CPSU Central Committee Statement on the Situation in the Soviet Baltic Republics. "All right, whether or not to subscribe to a newspaper is a personal matter for everyone," Ya.Ya. Vagris replied. "What can I say about the statement? It is not, of course, one of the best. But at the same time we cannot fail to notice that phenomena like those described do exist here. We leaders of the Baltic republics had a conversation with M.S. Gorbachev prior to the CPSU Central Committee plenum. We came to the opinion that we would remove this topic from discussion. Aware that we would soon be meeting with our voters, M.S. Gorbachev asked us to convey the fact that the statement should in no way be taken as criticism of entire Baltic peoples but only as criticism of discrete groups."

The voters also discussed M.S. Gorbachev's account in his report to the CPSU Central Committee plenum of the drawing up of the draft Law on the Statewide Status of the Russian Language. "Here the state status of the Latvian language in Latvia will remain in force," Ya.Ya. Vagris answered.

During 4 hours of lively discussion those present enquired about the opinions of the leaders of the country on the most varied problems of perestroyka with which the deputy is familiar. Questions concerning the future of the country and the republic alternated, so to speak, with acute and urgent domestic issues. How to carry out the capital repair of an apartment block? How to change a transport route? How to get visiting cards for pupils and students? Rayon leaders—F.A. Korneluis, first secretary of the Proletarskiy Rayon Committee, and G.V. Izranova, chairman of the rayon executive committee—therefore quite often joined in the dialogue.

At the end of the meeting the voters, while aware of how busy Ya.Ya. Vagris is, nevertheless asked that he receive people regarding personal matters. The deputy intends to devote one day per month to such a reception as from the end of October.

Khrushchev Ouster, Gorbachev Prospects Assessed

LD1310173789 Moscow World Service in English 0310 GMT 13 Oct 89

[From the "Inside Report" program, presented by Marina Dimova]

[Text] [Dimova] It is 25 years since Nikita Khrushchev's removal from power. In discussing the issue I am now joined by Dmitriy Volkov and Dmitriy Linnik:

[Linnik] The Central Committee plenum of October 1964 makes one wonder about whether such a sharp turn is possible today. The removal of Khrushchev from two top positions, that of first secretary of the party, same as general secretary of the party today, and the prime minister put paid to a period of reform and was a victory for conservative forces. There are more than one view of that actually the plenum meant where Khrushchev was forced to tender his resignation. One version has it that the sacking of Khrushchev was a correct step on the part of the party leadership; it was carried out by a body that had judicial powers to do so, a plenum of the Central Committee, and the decision was democratic. The reason for it was that by then Khrushchev had led the country into a political blind alley, and it's another matter that the choice of a new leadership with Leonid Brezhnev at the head was also erroneous.

[Volkov] Can one speak of a choice when the plenum and the session of the Central Committee Presidium and the Politburo that preceded it were a result of conspiracy? The conspiracy was led by people who were out

to grab power, primarily Leonid Brezhnev and Nikolay Podgornyy. We have enough witness accounts of those events to know how support for the takeover was enlisted.

[Linnik] Well, you're right about the sequence of events, but I believe narrowing it down to a conspiracy of a small group of individuals, even though in high positions, is simplistic. Can one believe that the reason for the forced resignation of Khrushchev lay solely in the power struggle in the party leadership? Doesn't it stand to reason that Khrushchev's policies created objective conditions for the failure of his reforms and for his own downfall?

[Volkov] Those reforms of the political system that he had time to carry out can hardly be overestimated. I mean the arrest of Stalin's crony, Beria, the condemnation of the Stalin purges and mass exoneration of the victims, and finally the removal from power of some of the more influential members of the Stalin leadership. All that can be viewed as uncompromising renunciation of the Stalin methods of ruling the country.

[Linnik] Well, that is true, but the system, the structure of ruling the nation, remained intact. Unlimited power of the party's top layer was preserved. The party apparatus kept control of all the aspects of public life and of the economy. Of course, it's a matter of paramount importance that Khrushchev put an end to repression, which was something that people in the ruling elite must have feared and may have supported, but even though the regime became more humane it still remained absolutely authoritarian.

[Dimova] We know that Khrushchev intended to make government more democratic, although he didn't mean to relieve the party apparatus of economic management or to create fullblooded soviets of the Councils of People's Deputies to effect political leadership. Khrushchev came up with the idea of rotation of functionaries, which would have been a blow at the omnipotence of the apparatus.

[Linnik] Though the idea was buried by those same functionaries and Khrushchev never got to the idea of resorting to other forces as a counterweight to the managerial apparatus rather than the apparatus itself. The party apparatus remained the supreme authority and any kind of dissenting opinion was hardly tolerated during the Khrushchev thaw in general and absolutely no dissenting view whatever was permitted in the corridors of power.

[Volkov] If we look at the very outset of the present policy of perestroyka, in declaring the policy of glasnost could Mikhail Gorbachev count on anything to counter the pressure of the apparatus? The soviets began to acquire real power only much later, while public opinion was simply impotent prior to glasnost. However, as a political leader Gorbachev managed to remain in control and now the apparatus can no longer dictate its will to the country unconditionally. It is a possibility that Khrushchev would have resorted to alternative public forces to balance out the pressure of the apparatus, that is if he were not removed then, but that is a mere supposition.

[Linnik] Well, be that as it may, Khrushchev was removed by the very force that constituted his own political basis, the bureaucracy, the apparatus. Yes, his plans were aimed at limiting the power of the bureaucracy even though by today's standards the plans were immature, but he couldn't have won in that struggle since he didn't even fathom the idea of restructuring the whole of society including the economy.

[Volkov] Still, his economic reforms are worthy of attention. I believe he tried to move in the same direction that we are moving in today.

[Linnik] Well, the similarity I believe is superficial. His basic concept was still the primacy of the public over the private or personal and unconditional supremacy of administrative planning over economic levers, over elements of a market economy.

[Volkov] An economic reform as we see it today could not take place then. The stereotype of a socialist economy then was unshakable—total centralization, rigid planning, and so forth. We cannot blame Khrushchev for not having been that much ahead of his time.

[Dimova] But he certainly made the economy more humane; I mean primarily his colossal housing program. Also, Khrushchev was the first to have declared the goal of achieving better living standards. His mistakes in the economy were mostly of a tactical nature, even though they resulted in serious problems and shortages of food which in turn led to popular discontent. About a year before his dismissal Khrushchev raised the prices of meat and dairy products and the next leadership castigated him for that, but they never lowered the prices.

[Linnik] You spoke of economic problems and popular discontent. That, plus resistance at the top, constitute objective reasons for Khrushchev's dismissal. Given our present economic problems and the resulting discontent, and also the fact that most politicians recognize the existence of opposition to Gorbachev's reforms, given all that, we have grounds to fear another coup.

[Volkov] I believe that is an over-dramatic view of the situation. Virtually all the strata of Soviet society have a vested interest in the success of perestroyka and the complex of reforms—democratization, glasnost and economic overhaul. And political reform has already curtailed the power of the chief opponent, the bureaucratic managerial apparatus.

[Linnik] But it's far from powerless in blocking government decisions, I mean the apparatus. Besides, if we take a close look at the current state of affairs we can assume that Soviet society displays all the elements of what is called a revolutionary situation in Marxism.

[Volkov] If we talk about the danger of a sharp turn in the political course, be it a coup or surrender to conservatives, I believe it is precisely the increased political awareness and activity of the people that will block the threat.

[Linnik] The nation's leader, Mikhail Gorbachev, remains firmly in control of the situation and the stability of the political situation is I believe ensured by the fact that his personal, party, and presidential powers can contain the broad public movements while they in turn, the movements, are capable of supporting his reforms. Preserving that balance is the chief task of the new parliament. And I also view this balance as a guarantee against a coup such as the one that ousted Nikita Khrushchev 25 years ago.

AUCCTU Chairman Salayev Interviewed

AU1310114889 Prague PRACE in Czech 10 Oct 89 p 5

[Interview with Stepan Salayev, chairman of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions, by Jozef Zelenak: "A Realistic Turnaround to the People's Needs"—in Moscow, date not given]

[Excerpts] [Passage omitted]

[Zelenak] The current social and political situation in the country sharply, and in a new way, raises a question about the place and role of the trade unions in society. In connection with this, the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions [AUCCTU] plenary session has established the trade unions' point of view on and urgent tasks for the present period. How would you characterize them?

[Salayev] At present the most pressing tasks facing the trade unions include strengthening our activity at the level of protecting the rights and interests of the working people; accelerating the resolution of social issues; and protecting the working people against the economic management of enterprises, where there is a need for this, because I do not mean that in every enterprise in our country the workers are exposed to management's arbitrary decision-making. Why has this protective role become more pressing? We rarely give consideration to this. Our people gave credit to the idea of restructuring and lodged their hopes in the conviction that the changes to people's lives and to society would be achieved in the short term. Four and a half years have gone by and the people's expectations have not always been fulfilled in everything. Many people, for example, thought that economic reform and, shall we say, the food program, would be implemented in 2 years. In spite of a certain growth and some changes, the people do not see a substantial breakthrough. [passage omitted]

A real turnaround toward the needs of the people has taken place during the years of restructuring. We see that under the new economic conditions it is possible to resolve many issues "below" on the spot. Our trade union committees are making better use of their legal possibilities to implement the people's natural desire to live better. [passage omitted]

[Zelenak] What kind of general evaluation did the participants in the 6th AUCCTU plenary session reach in the issue surrounding the mass strikes by the working people and what kind of conclusions did they draw from them?

[Salayev] First of all, I must say that many of the problems that served as a pretext for exacerbating the collective working conflicts had previously and many times been raised before local, republic, and central organs of state power as well as before the ministries and central authorities. True, because we were not thorough and persevering enough, the majority of them remained unresolved. An analysis of these events indicates that the fundamental reasons for the strikes were dissatisfaction with the organization of labor; the backwardness of the social sphere; and material difficulties. To a large extent, the working people link to this the fact that economic reform is not taking hold and the fact that the economic independence of enterprises and spheres is lacking. Many working collectives are not managers in their own enterprises. Rightly, one of the USSR people's deputies asked the question at the USSR Supreme Soviet session: Why on earth are the managers striking?

The majority of the working people see the reasons for the difficulties lying in the shortcomings in their economic rights. The fact that workers, in many cases, preferred to express their protest against the crude violations of social justice through the strike committees and not through the trade unions indicates a slump in the authority of the trade unions as the protectors of the working people's rights. The trades unions' mission is always to be with the working people. The AUCCTU plenum stressed that it is necessary to have an effective and reliable law to resolve collective working conflicts (disagreements) and it set the AUCCTU Presidium and the USSR people's deputies the task of trying to achieve its quick adoption on behalf of the trade unions. This forum also appealed to the working people to constructively resolve the aggravated problems, to demonstrate organizational ability, patience, and unity in the interest of fulfilling the tasks that restructuring is bringing.

A strike is a powerful, double-edged sword. Certainly, with it it is possible to attract the attention of the highest state and party organs to one's problems and to quickly achieve a solution to something that has not been managed in decades. At this level, it is a strong argument for protecting the working people's rights and as such it is possible, after exhausting all the other legal alternatives, to use it. On the other hand, it is impossible not to see that a strike negatively affects the striking collectives themselves, the country's economy, and its population whose standard of living declines as a result of it. Thus, it is impossible to make the strike weapon absolutely valid as the only means for the working class' struggle and as a miracle cure for all contemporary difficulties.

[Zelenak] The AUCCTU plenum declared it to be essential to determine the trade unions' point of view on some, recently extremely, aggravated social problems. Which viewpoint is the main one?

[Salayev] At the plenum we discussed in particular detail the situation in the country in connection with the increase in prices, the shortage of goods, the standard of living, and shortcomings in the collective movement. We adopted a final statement on these issues because these are the most serious problems that today are making all the Soviet people dissatisfied. In it we demand that the USSR Council of Ministers and the governments of the union's republics adopt measures without delay to "freeze" the prices of basic foodstuffs and industrial products, goods which are vital for the consumers' budget; this should be done under the conditions of the severe taxation of the working people's cash incomes which the USSR Supreme Soviet introduced last October. In the situation when prices are increasing, the trade unions will attempt to win from the government compensatory payments for those social sectors of the population whose real income has been reduced due to the influence of inflation. This will be done while considering the index that records the growth in prices of those goods that belong to the "consumer basket".

As far as the collective movement is concerned, we absolutely reject distortion of its ideas, a phenomenon which today is all too frequent. The trade unions will support only those collectives that supply goods and services at state prices and that influence the satiation of the market in the country with goods and services. Therefore, we are demanding the reregistration of collectives before the end of the year under the conditions of glasnost; the suspension of the activity of retailing and procurement, intermediary, and similar collectives, collectives which are only a guise for concealing speculation; the accelerated introduction of legal and economic norms which define the role and place of collectivism in society in order that it will have the same economic conditions as state enterprises; introduction of order into the determination of prices; strengthening the financial controls on their activity; and raising the social prestige of collectivism and introducing into it, first and foremost, available working sources—pensioners, invalids, housewives, and students.

Using the right of legislative initiative, we submitted a request to Mikhail Gorbachev that the USSR Supreme Soviet's commissions and committees discuss our proposals. The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium issued a decree signed by M. Gorbachev which sets the commissions and committees the task of studying the conditions raised by the AUCCTU and of submitting appropriate measures for the USSR Supreme Soviet's consideration. I also handed over the appropriate documents to Nikolay Ryzhkov, the prime minister, who set the task of preparing the government's contribution to our two documents. All of the people's deputies will also receive the above-mentioned materials. It is possible to eradicate many of collectivism's problems now; we are encouraging republican and regional trade union councils to do this. The time demands even more decisive and even more emphatic deeds from us as well as more active participation in overcoming the social tension which has arisen in the country and in society. [passage omitted]

[Zelenak] Apart from what has already been said, what would you say is the trade unions' point of view on the other problems facing the largest working people's organization?

[Salayev] Recently, very many new social organizations have evolved—ecological, social and political, and creative. At the 6th AUCCTU plenum we discussed the fact that the trade unions, as organizations representing the interests of the working people, cannot avoid cooperating with the associations which set out some of the same aims as we do, let us say, the ecological associations. Or the consumers' clubs—their congress is under preparation. We founded an all-union association which, however, will operate independently. This also concerns various workers' groups, individual popular fronts in the sphere of protecting the working people's interests, and others who concur with our activities. We are taking steps against a split along nationalist lines among the working class and the working people. After all, it is not possible to divide working collectives into a part consisting of the original population and a part consisting of others. Everyone must work together. We have declared our initiative for the unity of the working class, we categorically reject nationalist disputes.

The trade union councils and committees, the primary trade union organizations, and all trade union members should actively become involved in the upcoming campaign for the elections to the republican and local soviets of people's deputies, they should make broad use of this campaign, and put forward for these organs workers and peasants with authority, the significant organizers of production and science, trade union activists, and student representatives. In order that we achieve the broader representation of the working class and the peasantry in the organs of Soviet power, the AUCCTU plenum turned to the highest soviets in the union's republics with a proposal to introduce into the laws on elections to republic-level and local soviets the possibility of holding elections not only in territorial but also in manufacturing centers.

These are, roughly, the most important problems and urgent tasks facing the trade unions today, the tasks which we must resolve with all our thoroughness on behalf of the main goal of our activity—a better life for the working people. Our society, party, and all the working people have an interest in strong trade unions so that the country's largest social organization can demonstrate in its activity its independence, high principles, and creative initiative; so that it can actively support restructuring and all the changes; in order that it can resolutely defend the rights and interests of the working people; and so that this focus of the social and political system may be strong and reliable.

[Zelenak] Thank you for the interview.

Sep Plenum Discussion Reviewed

LD0110183389

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1600 GMT on 29 September carries a 30-minute program entitled, "What the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions (AUCCTU) Decided." The program provides an account of the discussion at the AUCCTU plenum, featuring video clips of various speakers. The program concludes with an interview with AUCCTU Deputy Chairman Klochkov.

The announcer introduces the program by noting that the main question the trade unions leaders tried to answer during the 2-day September plenum concerned how the trade unions can be "saved from bureaucracy." He says that representatives of the country's largest primary trade union organizations, leaders of strike committees, and people's deputies from the trade unions were invited to the plenum to ensure that the appraisal would be objective. The announcer says: "Yes indeed, we are accustomed to saying that the trade unions are the school of administration and the school of communism. Yet we have not noticed how these slogans long ago became detached from life. Meanwhile, the trade unions, which were founded to defend the interests and rights of the working man, have become the obedient executors of the will of the strong of this world. In terms of the openness and keenness with which the questions were phrased, never before was there such a plenum."

A clip of AUCCTU Chairman S.A. Shalayev addressing the plenum is shown. He says the working class is not satisfied with the rate of perestroyka and that it is being hit by the shortage of essential goods, speculation, and the rise in crime. He notes further: "The conviction is widespread among the workers that they are deprived of real levers with which to influence the adoption of socioeconomic decisions and the monitoring of how they are implemented. All this has prompted the working class for the first time in the years of perestroyka to enter, of its own accord, the struggle for its socioeconomic rights and interests. The country literally has been shaken by the miners' mass strikes and the conflicts in several other branches and regions of the national economy."

The announcer reports that last year and this year strikes have occurred in 40 oblasts, krays, and autonomous and union republics. He asks why the trade unions did not jump to the defense of the working people in time. He asks what lessons the trade unions have drawn from the strikes.

A clip of F.S. Sderzhikov, chairman of the Donetsk oblast council of trade unions, is shown. He maintains that the problems raised by the striking miners had been aired on several occasions in the past 2 ½ years.

A.V. Khrapach from Rostov oblast is shown. He elaborates: "The miners' strike movement was, above all, a consequence of the stagnation in the country's political and economic life and of a bureaucratic attitude toward the demands of the working people to resolve many issues of a professional, economic, and social nature that had accumulated over the decades. It is not merely the diktat of the economic bodies that is to blame for the situation that developed: The trade unions likewise must answer for the unsolved problems that prompted the workers to take these extreme measures. I must say that most of the trade union committees lost their heads and could not decide on which side of the barricades to stand. They waited for instructions from above."

Shalayev is shown again, supporting the idea of strikes: "I want to stress that the events of July have taught us another important lesson. They have shown just how powerful yet two-edged a strike can be. On the one hand, it instantly attracts the attention of the top state, government, and party bodies and the whole country. It speeds up the process of searching for solutions and mutually-acceptable compromises. In mere days and weeks, those issues, which had waited their turn for years or decades, are resolved. Both the working people and our trade unions did the right thing by supporting it. It is perfectly obvious that the trade unions must arm themselves in the future, too, with the strike, and use it when all other ways of resolving a conflict have been exhausted."

The announcer explains the other side of the coin, saying strikes can hurt the strikers and certainly damage the economy. He notes a direct consequence of the miners' strike was the loss of 7 million tonnes of coal, and incomplete figures suggest that the damage amounts to approximately R4 billion. He says for this reason the Law on Resolving Labor Disputes is essential, and the plenum supported the draft of this law.

Shalayev is again shown, asking the plenum to support a proposal to free trade union committees from work directly involved with economic and production tasks, and from various unspecified functions foisted unjustifiably on trade unions by local party, soviet, and economic bodies.

A clip of I.A. Shinkevich, chairman of the central committee of the rail transport and transport construction trade union, is shown. He warns that not everyone will be happy with a realignment of the work of trade unions. "But," he says, "I am convinced that our working people will approve and support the concentration of the attention of trade unions solely on defensive functions—something that will promote a further acceleration and deepening of perestroyka, as well as an upsurge in the prestige of and confidence in the trade unions."

E. Zhakselekov, chairman of the Kazakh Trade Union Council, continues the theme: "While acknowledging the party's leading role in consolidating all strata of our society in the present difficult processes of restructuring, at the same time my republic's trade unions are against

the diktat of the party apparatus, the petty tutelage, and the attempts to control the trade unions directly."

V.P. Shcherbakov, chairman of the Moscow City Trade Union Council, supports this: "Over many years, the trade union organizations have turned into an appendage of the state structure and an executive body of the party apparatus. By having so many directions in which to operate, the trade unions have lost face at the expense of the main task: the defense of the rights and interests of the working people." Shcherbakov notes that economic reform, financial autonomy, and the cooperative movement have all brought unexpected negative phenomena with them. He warns that the trade unions must not forget their most important functions, such as dealing with pay, living standards, health, workers' legal defense, etc.

Shalayev sums up the general mood: "At the plenum today, we again must state clearly that nobody has the right to foist on the trade unions functions that are not within their remit, or to force them to work for other public formations and administrative and economic personnel, thus diverting them from fulfilling their main task: defending the legitimate interests of the man of labor."

Shalayev proceeds to deal with the consumer market, the lack of goods and the rising cost of living. He says: "Because of the growing cost of living, more and more skilled workers and specialists are being forced to resort to making money on the side, to change their profession and place of work. Discipline is on the decline and there is a growing exodus of qualified personnel from the key branches of the national economy." He says the steps taken by the government to improve the economy do not go far enough toward stabilizing the situation of the working man.

F.A. Prokopenko of Lipetsk Oblast warns that if prices continue to rise the pension of R120 per month will be below the poverty line. He believes the trade unions must become involved in pricing policy, since prices affect the living standards of their members.

V.V. Kuzmenok, chairman of the Central Committee of the fishing industry's trade union, tackles another problem: "We must propose a resolution on combating speculation. It is not cooperative members who are engaged in speculation, but rather those others who masquerade behind the name. Try as our ideologists might to persuade us that, if we wait just a little, there will be competition and everything will sort itself out-...well, with my salary, I can hang on, and presumably all of us, comrades, in this hall can wait. But, those who sent us here are unlikely to put up with the waiting. So, this issue must be urgently resolved. We need neither a memorandum nor a resolution, but an ultimatum from the trade unions to the government, to announce a specific timetable for speculation to cease in this country." Kuzmenok's remarks are followed by prolonged applause.

L.M. Bidlyuchenko from Voroshilovgrad Oblast says the working man is not against cooperatives, but he does start to wonder how it is that the health cooperatives can supply the necessary medicaments, at a price, while state hospitals lack even the basic medicines.

Shalayev recounts how the trade unions so far have managed to oppose price rises for public transport, sporting events, and cinema tickets. He says he wants the state to be more active in countering such moves, and the same goes for the trade unions.

The announcer summarizes: "In its special statements, the plenum demanded that the government and the republic Councils of Ministers freeze prices on the basic foodstuffs and manufactured goods; introduce a maximum retail price for potatoes and vegetables, as has already been done in the Ukraine; and at the same time tighten state control on all sorts of retail prices for goods and services. The plenum declared that if the rise in prices does not cease, then the trade unions will press the government to introduce compensatory payments for those sections of society whose income is hit by inflation.

"There is another plenum statement on the attitude of the trade unions toward cooperatives. It says that the trade unions will support only those cooperatives that operate using state retail prices. The plenum demanded that the central and local bodies take urgent steps to protect the cooperative movement against secondhand dealers, speculators, and extortioners."

A final clip shows V.A. Romanov, chairman of the Kemerovo Oblast Council of Trade Unions, pressing, and receiving warm support, for the creation of a Russian republican council of trade unions.

The announcer concludes this section on the plenum by saying that this program could not hope to reflect all the topics discussed: the coming elections, hidden unemployment, interethnic relations, etc. He notes: "One thing can be said with confidence today: The trade unions have charted a course toward renovation, toward the uncompromising defense of the interests of the working man."

Next follows an interview with Igor Yevgeniyvich Klochkov, AUCCTU deputy chairman. He speaks of the work completed by the plenum and notes that it reflected the mood of a wide range of union activists and the reactions of primary organizations. He says he believes it is important that the plenum analyzed critical phenomena in the unions, which recently have increased. He points out: "The main reason for the mistrust, which appeared particularly during the July miners' strike, has its roots in the fact that the the unions had, to a significant degree, lost their defensive function." Union committees and councils tended to adopt half-measures and to take a conciliatory approach instead of acting as government opponents, Klochkov claimed. He condemns the "lack of principle" of union organs and the impunity of managers at various levels, including planning organs, for failures in social policies in certain parts

of the country. He says the unions must have "a reliable enough legal mechanism for them to implement their authority." For this reason, the passing of laws relating to unions and labor disputes is important, Klochkov states. He notes further that deputies from the union movement have therefore been instructed to secure the passing of these laws by the Supreme Soviet. Klochkov considers certain articles of the law on union rights particularly important. In particular, he says he has in mind the right of a union committee to veto decisions on social question; legal protection for union appointees; the right of a union to declare a strike; and the right to hold demonstrations in defense of their demands. He believes all this will create the mechanism for struggles by unions, which earlier did not exist. Unions were as society wanted to see them, but this has now changed dramatically, he states. Klochkov says: "At the same time, a completely new significance and meaning are acquired by collective agreements between the work collective and the administration or a superior economic organ of administration."

Klochkov answers a question on freeing primary union organizations and giving them rights in various spheres: "It is precisely there in the factory, where today passions seethe that, in fact, the authority of the unions is created." Some steps already had been taken before this plenum in giving unions more rights, and the plenum continued this process, he notes. Klochkov says that thoughts were expressed on the right of primary organizations to form higher union organs on the delegate principle.

Concerning the protective functions of the AUCCTU, Klochkov says: "First of all, there is the defense of working people's interests on the level of the union government and central economic departments. There are the questions of prices and the minimum standard of living. There is the question of the priority development of group 'b.' There is the question of the priority of consumption in the structure of the distribution of national income. There is the question of drawing up and implementing social programs." He says all workers and union members should be well informed about all this and, for this reason, information bureaus are to be created and the AUCCTU press center is to be strengthened. "Thoughts also were expressed on the need for meetings between the presidiums of the AUCCTU and the USSR Council of Ministers, for meetings between union activists and the leadership of the party and the Central Committee general secretary," he said. He notes that a Russian federation council of trade unions will be founded, which will be an independent union organ in Russia, keeping with the decisions of the last CPSU Central Committee plenum.

Klochkov stresses one feature of the declarations containing demands on the government which were adopted by the AUCCTU plenum: "The participants in the plenum gave the people's deputies from the trade unions the task of raising in the USSR Supreme Soviet the question of carrying out an official investigation into the shortage of goods, which has arisen in those groups where there had always been a sufficiency." He says this upsets people and must be looked into to find out who is to blame.

"As far as unions representing different industries leaving the AUCCTU is concerned, this is isolation from the country's union movement and someone's political interests are behind these demands," Kochkov states. He says he believes that "the AUCCTU is needed by the working people. It is another matter that it must change its appearance in the spirit of today's demands and its style and methods of work. It must to a greater degree fulfill the functions of a council of trade union for different industries, as do the councils of trade unions in oblasts, krays, and republics." He notes it is important who is elected in the coming elections to the leadership of union bodies. The arrival of new, fresh, authoritative people will provide a guarantee for the fight with bureaucracy in the unions, Klochkov concludes.

Kemerovo Official Speech Reported

18280284a Moscow TRUD in Russian
6 Sep 89 p 3

[Report on speech by Chairman of the Kemerovo Oblast Trade Union Council V.I. Romanov at the AUCCTU Plenum; published with "slight abridgments"]

[Excerpt] The trade unions have a duty to take an uncompromising position in defending the interests of workers by shedding the burden of functions which are not in their domain and the position of "subordination" to the party, soviet, and economic organs, and to strive for resolute perestroyka in all spheres of our life. This is what the participants in the plenum talked about during the discussion of the report by the AUCCTU [All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions] chairman. Only such an approach will enable the trade unions to find their genuine niche in the life of our society.

Chairman of the Kemerovo Oblast Trade Union Council V.I. Romanov took the floor. It is difficult to overstate the significance of our plenum which is held at a complex stage in the life of our country, at a period of reports and elections in the trade unions, he said. If we adopt a correct decision today the trade unions will take heart, trade union activities will pick up; if we do not justify the hopes—let us be frank—processes which will be hard to stop will begin to develop inside and around the trade unions. Let me point out several of the most acute problems which, as we see it, are in need of an urgent solution.

First. Why are many trade union organs at all levels, beginning with the trade union committee and through the AUCCTU, now teetering on the brink of a profound loss of authority? After all, we know the difficulties and troubles in the life of labor collectives and the populace no worse and, perhaps, better than others; we analyze and work out programs which the workers support. For example, the election platform of the trade unions,

instructions to people's deputies, as well as a number of other documents, have been widely acclaimed. However, procrastination in executing them, indecisiveness, timidity in work, attempts to either adjust to or join somebody, and the performance of functions not falling within our domain are causing tremendous dissatisfaction and criticism leveled at us.

The July strikes of miners in the Kuzbass showed that the mining and other collectives did not entrust the trade unions with either expressing or advocating just demands, despite the latter being based on trade union policy documents. Strike committees assumed these functions. In all of that, I must say that recently the trade union organs have primarily been the ones to create a situation of alarm and implacability with regard to violations of the principle of social justice in the oblast. Paradoxical as it is, they have also been the ones not to be trusted. A number of trade union committee chairmen were elected to the city committees and headed them at enterprises, but this gives us little consolation. Trade union organizations turned out not to be prepared organizationally for defending the collectives and averting mass conflicts. The workers showed themselves to indeed be the leading force of perestroyka, and challenged in an open and honest battle the distortions and ills of our society. The acceptance of the Protocol on Coordinated Measures between the strike committees of the Kuzbass and the commission of the Central Committee of the party, the USSR Council of Ministers, and the AUCCTU relieved the tense situation somewhat. At present the council of workers' committees of the Kuzbass and city workers' committees are in operation which monitor the execution of the decisions made.

In early August the oblast trade union council considered some of the results of the strikes held. Procedures for the actions of trade union organs in the event conflict situations arise in the labor collectives were set forth on the basis of the resolution of the AUCCTU Presidium. Some trade union committees are already acting pursuant to them. We made a decision to hold elections to the trade union committees before the term, as requested by the strike committees; in August and September new elections of all councils of labor collectives will be held. I have to note that in the opinion of labor collectives, a strike or workers' committee is not needed where a strong council of the labor collective and trade union committee have been elected.

The situation in the oblast remains difficult; it depends on many circumstances but mainly on the implementation of measures provided for by the protocol. They are being carried out slowly; on many points, the deadlines are not being met or decisions are not being made. This is why we believe it necessary for the commission of the Central Committee of the party, the USSR Council of Ministers, and the AUCCTU—specifically Comrades Slyunkov, Voronin, and Shalayev—which worked in our area, to consider in September or October the course of implementing coordinated measures while visiting the oblast.

Second. We are concerned about the fact that the AUCCTU, its presidium and secretariat do not always build their relations with soviet, state, and economic organs and public organizations on the basis of independent partnership with equal rights. This is the root problem! We are convinced that had the AUCCTU stood up staunchly there would not have been the so-called "letter of the four" on determining the ratio between the increment of wages and labor productivity, there would not have been an explosion of dissatisfaction in the country on this account.

Many resolutions are being adopted jointly with the committees of the USSR Council of Ministers rather than the Council of Ministers itself; after all, the committees are equal in terms of their status to ministries. Even resolutions such as those on procedures for signing collective contracts, on procedures for electing the councils of labor collectives and managers, which, in our opinion, should be considered together with the government of the country only, have been adopted jointly with the State Committee for Labor and Social Problems.

Let us ask this question: Why should not AUCCTU commissions adopt resolutions with committees and ministries? Why should we not start practicing joint meetings of the AUCCTU Presidium and the USSR Council of Ministers on the most acute and urgent problems and make these meetings public? As we see it, inadmissible confusion of functions occurs. We have received with pain the meeting of the USSR Supreme Soviet at which Comrade Shalayev presented the draft Law on Procedures for Settling Collective Labor Disputes. Why was our chairman alone? The draft was submitted for consideration by the Council of Ministers and the AUCCTU. However, why didn't the other party, the government of the country, present it and respond to questions? Could it be that, say, Prime Minister Comrade Ryzhkov has a lesser need for this law? It appears to me that today, in the report, there are no suggestions as to how to proceed if the government once again will not comply with our demands. After all, we have already encountered this repeatedly. They do not ask but demand in primary trade union organizations that the trade unions be autonomous, independent, and equal.

Third. For more than a year and a half we have been engaged in streamlining the structure of trade unions and reducing the staff of the apparatus of trade union organs. However, it so happened that reductions in the apparatus rather than the structure has become the main task. I am in favor of stopping for now those eager to repattern the structure—now is not the time, and this also causes many calamities. However, I believe that it is urgent to resolve two issues of this problem. While approving the draft platform of the party on the issues of nationalities policy overall, the trade union aktiv of the oblast has been discussing with special attention the issues of the legal status of the Russian Federation and its national-state arrangement. This has long been due. We come out in favor of creating elected organs of all social organizations of our republic. We need the Russian Republic

Council of Trade Unions rather than the proposed... (Applause) Thank you for your support! ...rather than the proposed, possibly, again on someone's instructions, something like an AUCCTU buro or secretariat for the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic]. We cannot go along with mainly the AUCCTU apparatus expressing the interests of the trade unions of Russia in both the AUCCTU and the government, and, speaking frankly, nobody expressing them.

Only the council may fully express and protect the interests of the workers of the north, of western and eastern Siberia, the Far East, and the European section of the country in the government of the republic. Only the council may exert vigorous influence on the development and fulfillment of the plans of socioeconomic development of the republic and its regions. We need branch committees of the trade unions of the republic, and nothing else is acceptable. We do not even have time to waste for carrying out experiments which are doomed ahead of time. Yesterday this issue was discussed at a conference of chairmen of kray and oblast trade union councils of the Russian Federation. We arrived at the unanimous opinion that this is an extremely important issue, and we should not procrastinate in considering it.

We have the following proposal: To adopt at the present plenum a resolution on forming the Russian Republic Council of Trade Unions, set the date for holding the First Congress of RSFSR Trade Unions, and charge the AUCCTU Presidium with setting up an organizational committee for preparing it. As far as the staff of the republic council is concerned, it may be formed at the expense of reducing the AUCCTU apparatus, and republic committees at the expense of reducing the apparatus of Central Committees of trade unions. We hope that our reasoning will be supported by the AUCCTU members from the Ukraine, Kazakhstan, and other union republics which have been working for decades within the structure we are now striving for. We ask that our proposals be included in the draft resolution and put up to a separate vote at our plenum.

Second issue. An in-depth discussion of increasing the role of the main element of trade unions, primary organizations, has taken place at two AUCCTU plenums. A lot of what has been conceived is being implemented, but these questions are even now the focal problem. In solving it, we should proceed from the fact that regional economic accountability is being implemented, and collectives are given complete economic and legal independence. The law on local self-government will be passed soon. The functions of ministries and departments are changing. Under these conditions, the role of territorial trade union organs objectively grows, and an acute necessity arises to pool the efforts and coordinate the activities of trade union organizations. This was mentioned in the report. Those who put a black blindfold over their eyes on purpose do not see this. However, we should approach this in a balanced manner after an in-depth discussion in the AUCCTU, trade union councils, central committees of trade unions, and primary organizations.

I will say frankly: I cannot understand the unfolding struggle for financial power, and finding out who is more important—the Central Committee of the trade union or the trade union council? Every element is important, and now is not the time to go at each other; we should not stir things up but should unite.

Finally comrades, we received with pain the statement by Comrade Gorbachev at the meeting with the party aktiv of Krasnodar Kray. I quote: "...trade union leaders walk on the managers' arm, and folk dance with them,"—this was said in September 1986. Then, those applauded this conclusion who wish that the trade union organizations would dance to the tune of the command-administrative system at present as well. In the report "Restructuring Party Work—the Most Significant Key Task of the Day" in July 1989, trade unions are painted almost as the main culprits responsible for the aggravated situation and conflicts. This conclusion is adopted by those for whom the main point is to find those guilty. I believe that all of this is prompted by the functionaries of party apparatuses who are outwardly in favor of the autonomy and independence of trade unions but who actually impose a position which disarms us and want to have in trade unions obedient executors of arbitrary decisions. It is a major mistake to pick on the trade unions as a whole; it is correct to address the criticism to the elected organs and their leaders. I believe that this will be both honest and fair.

Comrades, at present we need to talk about the interaction of the party and the trade unions rather than the party leading the trade unions. As far as leadership is concerned, it should be performed only through the communists working in trade union organs. Comrades, we need to break down rather than carefully revise unacceptable mutual relations with the party, state, and economic organs; we should do it on our own initiative because they will not proceed to do it themselves.

In summation, comrades, I would like to say: We have spent years coming to the present condition; however, life which is dynamic in the period of perestroyka gives us merely months in order to begin establishing our own perceptible identity. We have great rights, and they will be greater yet. However, we do not have two rights: the right to a mistake and the right to be overcome by events. (Applause) [passage omitted]

Aircraft Crashes 'Recently' in Chernigov Oblast

PM0510141389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 6

[Report by R. Ignatyev under the "Incidents" rubric: "Transport Aircraft Accident"]

[Text] An AN-32 transport aircraft was involved in an accident recently in the region of the population center of Semenovka, Chernigov Oblast. There are casualties.

Our correspondent asked I. Mashkivskiy, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers State Commission for Oversight of Aircraft Safety, to describe the details of the incident.

"The AN-32 aircraft, which belongs to the USSR Ministry of the Aviation Industry transport aviation production association, was on a flight from Mukachevo to Moscow. It was carrying official freight. The flight was at an altitude of 7,500 meters when at 2008 hours a controller at the Kiev regional center of the unified air traffic control system suddenly discovered that the aircraft's radar signal had disappeared from the screen.

"A search for the lost aircraft began. It was found only 4 ½ hours later 15-18 km from Semenovka. Specialists from the USSR State Commission for Oversight of Aircraft Safety, the O.K. Antonov experimental design bureau, the USSR Ministry of the Aviation Industry scientific research institute, the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, and the Ministry of Defense flew to the scene of the accident.

"The AN-32 had fallen into a peat bog, forming a crater over 7 meters deep. The crater has filled with water, which is making the specialists' work more difficult. The main parts of the aircraft, the engines and cabin, were under the swamp sludge. Pieces of the chassis were scattered over a radius of over 1 km. With the aid of a helicopter a search is under way for individual parts of the aircraft. According to preliminary figures it has been established that 10 people died—the entire crew and passengers escorting the freight. Right now the number of people flying on this aircraft is being ascertained.

"Equipment is being used to dig a channel along which the water is to be pumped from the crater. The so-called black boxes have been successfully found.

"It is so far too early to speak of the reasons for the accident. There are several versions. There may have been an explosion on board the aircraft."

Children Contract AIDS in Stavropol Hospital

PM1510171989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 2

[Own correspondent V. Oliyanchuk report: "Another Outbreak of AIDS"]

[Text] Stavropol—Four children have been diagnosed as AIDS virus carriers in the Stavropol children's hospital. They all have been urgently moved to the clinic of the all-union center for struggle against this disease in Moscow.

A commission of the Russian Federation's Ministry of Health headed by Ye. Belyayev, chief of the Epidemiology and Hygiene Main Administration, has started work in Stavropol. Speaking at a sitting of the emergency anti-epidemiology commission, he noted that the kray's public health administration, alarmed by the calamity which has befallen neighboring Kalmykia, has taken serious preventive measures—it has set up centralized sterilization departments in medical institutions making it possible to correctly handle syringes and instruments and has launched preventive work among the population and specialized work among medical personnel. The diagnosis of infection was followed immediately by urgent screening of everyone who had been in contact with the victims—a total of 950 children and 245 adults.

The sitting identified the medical institutions which are in no hurry to prepare for a possible encounter with the AIDS infection and have even failed to install sterilization equipment acquired with difficulties. Furthermore, blatant facts have come to light showing that medical personnel grossly violate elementary requirements regarding the use of syringes and instruments. The paramount question is: Where can disposable syringes be obtained? People in Stavropol have appealed to the government and have knocked on the doors of the kray's largest enterprises which have sizable reserves of foreign currency earned through foreign trade operations: Help us buy syringes abroad! So far, only the "Stavropolpolimer" and "Azot" Associations have responded....

Problems Discussed at Inaugural AIDS Conference

90US0039 Riga SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH in Russian 21 Sep 89 p 4

[Yelena Vlasova report: "Life Without AIDS. Is This Possible Today?"]

[Text] AIDS is no longer the disease of prostitutes and homosexuals. Just 2 or 3 years ago we thought that AIDS had been brought to us from abroad. Today it is circulating freely in the country, and the number of victims is growing. What has happened in Kalmykin, Rostov-on-Don, and Volgograd can in no way be ascribed to "risk groups"; innocent people have become victims, mainly children infected with the virus in hospital. The calm complacency of physicians, now shattered by the alarm being sounded in the press, gives us no guarantee that the "simple" injection or dentist's filling will not cause an infection with the deadly virus. Last year the USSR Council of Ministers' targets for the production of Soviet-made instruments to diagnose AIDS was not met, and the situation is the same with disposable syringes. The republic's requirement for them is being satisfied by only 10 to 15 percent. There is a catastrophic shortage of dentistry instruments, blood transfusion systems, and gloves. A joke that was recently very popular has now become a reality that is not funny: Each year we produce three condoms for every Soviet man. AIDS is quietly moving across the country, meeting no serious opposition, or even watchfulness. In 1987 we knew of only 32 cases of the infection, but today the number is already 289. Eleven people in the USSR have died from AIDS. And these are just those we know about. Is life possible without AIDS? How can we avoid this outbreak? These problems were discussed at an inaugural conference to set up the Latvian national association "Life without

AIDS." This is what some of those attending the conference said. Doctor of medical sciences A. Sochnev: Six carriers of the virus have now been found in Latvia and 28 persons are being monitored immunologically (it has still not been possible to make an accurate diagnosis). Two foreigners infected with the virus have been deported from the republic. The situation in Latvia, which lies within the "risk zone," is cause for serious concern: the increasing flow of foreign tourists, more trips abroad, developed international maritime sailings (the ports in Riga, Liyepaya, and Ventspils), and all-union resorts with a high population migration. In terms of its cultural and religion traditions we can categorize Latvia as a Baltic country, like Denmark, for example. In those countries the level of homosexuality and drug addiction is about the same. And this means that in a few years times, already by 1995-1997, we can expect an AIDS epidemic. We do not have the right to repeat the mistakes made abroad. The fight against AIDS is still being waged with avid enthusiasm. Latvia has been one of the first republics to start monitoring the blood supply used in transfusions. However, the range of diagnostic facilities that we use cannot offer any 100-percent guarantees. We must combine the efforts of all organizations and conduct active propaganda for a healthy way of life and preventive measures, starting at school age. Candidate of economic sciences R. Dukats talked about the economic aspects of the fight against AIDS. We have no economists in the country who have studied the AIDS problem. If we are expecting a flare-up in the disease in the republic by 1996, we shall need $15 million. At the time of an outbreak 1.5 percent of the able-bodied population will be sick—70,000 people. And they will be mostly young people aged 25 to 39. In New York, for example, AIDS is the primary cause of death for persons in that age group. AIDS is costing the state dearly. In industrial countries from $20,000 to $100,000 are spent for each patient. This year the U.S. Government has allocated $1.3 billion for the program to fight AIDS. The USSR spent R1.5 million just to eliminate one outbreak of AIDS in one hospital. And this is just the beginning of enormous spending... There is a catastrophic shortage of disposable syringes. But I see no sense in producing them just inside the republic. Throughout the world there are three or four companies that specialize in the production of disposable syringes and needles; the other companies are involved only in assembly and packaging. We must also focus on international cooperation... From the standpoint of the prelate of the Catholic Church, AIDS is mankind's payment for his loss of faith and fidelity and his disruption of the harmony between man and nature. We are dealing with the consequences but not the causes of the disease. Alas! Today moral purity and a return to spiritual values do not provide any guarantee that infection will be avoided, for random people and children whose souls have not been sullied with sin are becoming victims. We must fight AIDS together. The church cannot stand aside from this. One Catholic publication has given over one of its pages for discussion of AIDS problems. It is necessary to improve legislation so that state organs and the deputies can see what is really being done to deal with this threatening disease; this was the thought expressed in the statement by the representative of the Latvian People's Front. When the charter for the association was being discussed, about 60 people, mainly medical personnel, remained in the Hippocrates Hall of the Riga Medical Institute where the inaugural conference was held. Can the AIDS threat still remain a purely medical problem? Perhaps the fault here lies with the lack of information and advertising. But representatives of the most diverse organizations, movements, and societies were invited to the conference. Can it be that some people still think this calamity will miss them? It is high time to get down to business. One of the first to realize this was the Latvian Cooperative Union; it has donated R50,000 to buy disposable syringes. There is no medicine against AIDS. Today we need common sense, prudence, and combined efforts. Only this will help to avoid catastrophe.

Infant Mortality Rates Cited

LD1410195489

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1530 GMT on 14 October carries a 2-minute video report in the "Vremya" newscast from an unnamed maternity ward. The report focuses on the current infant mortality rates.

The announcer notes that, "since the infant mortality rate was first published, it has fallen by 10 percent." The announcer does not elaborate on the previously published figures. The report continues, "In this country, 35 out of 100,000 women die in childbirth. These figures have not yet been published. I am quoting them for the first time. For a comparison, 4 in 100,000 women in Scandinavian countries die in childbirth and in the United States, France, and Japan 10-12 women die in childbirth."

Report on Rising Crime Rate in USSR Viewed

LD1110093689 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 10 Oct 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Announcer] A briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists on the state of crime in the Soviet Union during the past 9 months of this year has taken place at the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry:

[Correspondent V.Bakarinov, identified by caption] [video shows footage from briefing room with panel of four—3 civilians and 1 official in military uniform, captioned as A.N.Smirnov, answering questions] The Internal Affairs Ministry leadership is informing the public about the crime situation in the country. This has already become a tradition. And it looks as if this is yielding results. At any rate, truth and glasnost make it possible to correctly assess the situation which has come

about. [video shows Bakarinov interviewing A.N.-Smirnov; Smirnov is captioned as chief of the Main Information Center of the USSR Internal Affairs ministry]

[Bakarinov] Anatoliy Ivanovich, a question on the topic of the press conference. During the 9 months of this year 1.75 million crimes were registered in the country, or 33.3 percent more than during the same period of last year. The fact that the number of grave crimes has increased is also causing concern. It is now 14.5 percent of registered crimes. Crimes against property perpetrated in various regions of the country make up some 57.4 percent. Everything is made clear when a comparison is made. Could you compare this with the rise in crime in the large, in the developed capitalist countries?

[Smirnov] Unfortunately, we do not have information regarding the number of crimes committed in the past 2 years. But if these figures are compared with 1986, the level of crime per 100,000 inhabitants looks as follows:

In the USSR: 713 crimes;
In the United States: 5,479 crimes;
In Japan: 1,400 crimes;
In the FRG: 7,153 crimes;
In France: 5,955 crimes;
In Britain: 7,706 crimes.

[Bakarinov] Are the motives for committing crimes in the West different from, the motives for committing crimes in our country?

[Smirnov] In my view we do not observe any specific crimes which are inherent our social system. Thefts are committed in all countries. Crimes against the person are committed in all countries, unfortunately. There are the same thefts of cars. That is to say, it seems to me that in this respect criminal manifestations are similar to a considerable extent in many countries. Another matter is that in each specific case, in each criminal case, one must look for personal symptoms, indications, which have induced a person to commit some crime or other.

Soviet Air Traffic Control Organ Needed

PM0310133989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Sep 89 Second Edition p 6

[Colonel V. Izgarshev article: "Emergency: Nobody in Charge of the Sky?"]

[Text] Toward evening on 27 September—more exactly at 1655—a balloon carrying a Soviet student and a Danish citizen took off from the M. Gorkiy Central Park of Culture and Leisure. An hour later, flying over central Moscow toward Tushino, the balloon landed near the beltway in the region of Strogino.

There it was loaded onto a truck which the balloonists had hired from some cooperative and returned to their point of departure.

So what? What happened? Just think, a balloon floated over the capital at a height of 70 meters and landed. The balloonists are both well, it was yet another sight for Muscovites... That would seem to be the end of it. But no, not quite!... The balloon was foreign, it was not a Soviet balloon. And the balloonists' intention was different. They wanted—in order to "demonstrate their peace-loving aspirations," as they put it—to fly over the Kremlin and land in Red Square. But then the wind took a hand...

The point is not the balloon or the wind, however. This flight, as you will realize, had not been authorized. To call a spade a spade, this was nothing short of an act of hooliganism. By way of information I would note that as the "object" approached Tushino sailplaners and helicopter pilots from the Voluntary Society for the Promotion of the Army, Aviation, and Navy had to curtail their flights. And warnings were even issued to Vnukovo airliners—descents and approaches are made over Strogino and Troitse-Lykovo. Just as the balloon landed a Tu-134 airliner was flying nearby. The pilots did not see the balloon. What if the aircraft had hit the balloon? The late General L. Goreglyad, who had independently investigated the cause of the death of Yuriy Gagarin, told me that the aircraft on which the first cosmonaut was traveling could have become "caught up" in a weather balloon, destroying the engine.

Now to turn to the essence of the matter. Both the M. Rust flight and other extraordinary events in both past and recent history seem to have taught us nothing. The State Motor Vehicle Inspection Administration is in charge of transportation on the ground. But what about in the sky? Nobody is in charge in the sky. Each department with its own aircraft deals with airspace in its own way. An Air Force commander recently held tactical exercises and asked Aeroflot to suspend flights in the area for several hours. The civil aviation minister reasonably replied that such a suspension would cost millions. Understandably, the commander decided not to risk millions.

Last summer it was decided at the highest level to set up a unified organ responsible for the sky. Relevant organizations were given instructions and a timetable was set for their execution. More than a year has passed, and things have not budged an inch. Nobody is in charge of the sky. Every day 80,000-100,000 flights are made by aircraft and helicopters over our country. In the summertime tens of thousands of hail-suppression shells are released into the clouds every day. Some 1,500 aerostats and weather balloons are launched. Tens of thousands of shells and mortars fly through the air at artillery ranges. And there are so many hang gliders and sailplanes soaring aloft!

Who is keeping an eye on all this, and where?

In the United States, pilots have told me, air traffic control [ATC] is the third priority after SDI and the space shuttle. It is said that the president personally

monitors its activity. In Europe, too, an effective automated system dubbed "Eurocontrol" has been set up.

At the recent international "21st Century Aviation" symposium in Moscow one of the four days was devoted to ATC. Our symposium participants saw for themselves that, figuratively speaking, as far as ATC systems are concerned, their Western colleagues are speeding along in a Mercedes while we are lagging behind in an old horse-drawn cart. Hence the chaos in our skies. People in the West have long flown according to a system ensuring the shortest route between two points. Whereas we fly to a map with rectangular coordinates. For instance, the ideal route from Moscow to Khabarovsk would be 600 km shorter; the route to Omsk would be 150 km shorter. And so forth. Work it out at your leisure—100,000 flights a day following the shortest routes! A river of saved fuel! And what about the time that would be saved?

Whichever way you look at it, we are losing out. Yet nobody has to come up with any new ideas. Other people have long enjoyed all these systems, and even our specialists have long known what should be done and how when it comes to ATC.

And yet senior comrades do need to meet, reach agreement, and set up an organ—be it a state committee or state commission—to take charge of our skies. With somebody in charge there will be no loopholes for Rusts or Danish balloonists. There will be more order.

As for for "demonstrations of love of peace," we are in favor of them. And we are also in favor of developing ballooning as a sport. It's a question of the method!

Militia Drills in Minsk Area Remain Unexplained

90UN0015A Minsk SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA in Russian 19 Sep 89 p 3

[Report by N. Dubovik, SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA correspondent: "Questions Remain Unanswered"]

[Text] "...The militia gathered there! They all had shields and billy clubs. It was frightful how much equipment they brought along with them."

The excited voice on the other end of the line continued to describe the details, but for the sake of expediency I had to interrupt my unseen caller.

"Where is this happening?"

The caller momentarily stopped short, not anticipating being interrupted at the most interesting point of his story.

"Why do you say this is happening? It's already happened. In the vicinity of Selkhozposelok in Sovetskiy Rayon in Minsk."

He hung up as if he had taken offense.

But in reality, what did happen there? Why was there such a powerful militia contingent gathered there? Could it be a "false report." I called the number of the Sovetskiy Rayon Department of Internal Affairs [ROVD] duty officer.

The duty officer responded, "You would do better to contact the Minsk Gorispolkom's Administration of Internal Affairs."

The duty officer for the Administration of Internal Affairs advised me to talk to Deputy Chief I.M. Sribniy for more precise information. Ivan Mikhaylovich, evidently, was quite busy.

"Nothing terrible happened. It was a routine drill."

"How often are they conducted?"

"Regularly."

"The object of the drills?"

"The drills were coordinated at all levels. What other questions could you have?"

"Ivan Mikhaylovich, why don't we discuss this in more detail so there won't be any misunderstandings."

"I don't think the public needs to be informed about these drills."

"Good. Then let's talk about cooperation. Lately the militia has not at all been talked about in such glowing terms."

"We are preparing an article on patrol-guard duty...."

"But for which newspa...."

"Good-bye. All the best."

Such was the conversation.

Officials Rapped Over Treatment of Veterans

PM2509091389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "In the CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee. On Serious Shortcomings in the Work by Communists in Leadership Positions in the Karelian Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic To Fulfill the CPSU Central Committee Resolution 'On Additional Measures To Improve the Living Conditions of War and Labor Veterans'"]

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee examined the results of the check on Karelian Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic [ASSR] leaders' fulfillment of the CPSU Central Committee resolution dated 12 May 1988 on additional measures to improve the living conditions of war and labor veterans. The committee's decision on the results of the check notes that Communists in leadership positions—Comrade Yu.N. Ivanov, chairman of the Karelian ASSR

Council of Ministers; Comrade L.P. Kitsa, first deputy chairman; Comrades T.A. Testennikova, V.I. Pomazkov, A.K. Artemyev, ministers of social security, trade, and public health respectively—and also [leaders of] a number of local soviets and republic enterprises are displaying a lack of discipline in fulfilling the CPSU Central Committee resolution and underestimate the sociopolitical significance of the problem of improving the living conditions of veterans and invalids.

The targets for developing the material base of social security establishments set for the 5-year plan are not being fulfilled in the republic, capital investments are being diverted to other projects, and there are instances of refusal to construct residential homes. In the first 3 years of the current 5-year plan only 28 percent of the plan to construct residential homes was fulfilled. The completion of the provision of amenities for existing residential homes as planned for the 5-year plan is threatened with disruption.

Questions of providing housing for those who participated in the Great Patriotic War, internationalist servicemen, and labor veterans are being solved only slowly. The number of needy war invalids and deceased soldiers' families is not decreasing and totals 475 families. Social and medical aid to war and labor veterans is insufficient.

Comrade T.A. Testennikova, the republic's minister for social security, displays complacency and is not taking effective measures to mobilize and coordinate the efforts of ministries, departments, and local soviets to improve the living conditions of veterans and invalids. Some residential homes are overcrowded to almost double their capacity. There is a shortage of furniture, elevators, trolleys, and other equipment in them. There are shortcomings in the organization of catering.

The leaders of the Ministry of Trade and the Karelian Union of Consumer Trade Cooperatives devote little attention to improving the care of veterans. The provision of foodstuffs and industrial goods, public catering, and the delivery of hot food to homes is not organized satisfactorily. The standard of trade is low, and there are few specialized stores, sections, and departments. In order to obtain orders for products in the days leading up to holidays, veterans have to stand in line for hours. Virtually no work is being done for the study of demand and the manufacture of cheap goods by local enterprises.

Comrade A.K. Artemyev, minister of health, is delaying the solution of the question of setting up a hospital for war invalids, and is not demanding enough about the state of veterans' screening and the provision of all the necessary medical assistance to them.

With the switch to economic accountability, certain labor collectives have slackened the attention paid to questions of rehabilitating invalids and labor veterans and of their job placement. Sponsorship work by collectives of enterprises, construction sites, state farms [sovkhozes] and collective farms [kolkhozes] is not reinforced by officials' effective supervision of the fulfillment of the "Care" program approved for the years 1988 through 1990. Individual leaders display callousness and egotism toward veterans and tolerate excessive red tape in solving questions of siting and constructing social establishments and strengthening the material base and upkeep of residential homes.

On the part of the oblast party committee, the Petrozavodsk city party committee [gorkom], the Kondopozhskiy, Medvezhyegorskiy, Olonetskiy, and Suoyarvskiy rayon party committees, and many primary party organizations, there is less supervision over the implementation of the CPSU Central Committee resolution, and demands on Communists who are in leadership positions to show concern for veterans and invalids and to fulfill the plan targets to assimilate the funds allocated for these purposes have been relaxed.

The CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee severely reprimanded Comrade Yu.N. Ivanov, member of the CPSU and chairman of the Karelian ASSR Council of Ministers, for unsatisfactory work in fulfilling the CPSU Central Committee resolutions to improve the living conditions of war and labor veterans and for diverting funds and systematically wrecking targets to develop the material base of the social service and warned him about his responsibility for taking exhaustive measures to eliminate the shortcomings permitted in this work.

Comrade T.A. Testennikova, Karelian ASSR minister of social security and member of the CPSU, has been severely warned for not being sufficiently demanding of workers in subordinate organizations to maintain existing residential homes in proper order and to construct new ones, and for serious omissions in organizational work on social services to war and labor veterans.

The CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee noted that the Karelian Oblast Party Committee did not draw the necessary conclusions from the CPSU Central Committee resolution of 12 May 1988 "On Additional Measures To Improve the Living Conditions of War and Labor Veterans," failed to monitor its fulfillment, and did not examine the question of the party responsibility of the Communists in leadership positions who displayed a lack of discipline in this question. The committee took into consideration a statement made by V.A. Ivanov, second secretary of the party obkom, that the question of the responsibility of officials guilty of failing to fulfill decisions to improve the living conditions of war and labor veterans will be examined by the party obkom, gorkoms, and raykoms in the very near future, the necessary measures have been taken to eliminate the shortcomings revealed by the check, and organizational work to develop the material base of social security and to raise the standard of service to war and labor veterans has been stepped up.

Account was taken of statements by Comrade N.T. Trubilin, deputy chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Council of Ministers, and Comrade V.A. Kaznacheyev, RSFSR minister of social security, that they will take additional measures to implement the program to develop the network of residential homes, to step up supervision of the strengthening of the material and technical base of social security in the Karelian ASSR, and to eliminate shortcomings in fulfilling party and government decisions to improve the living conditions of war and labor veterans.

People Should Not 'Irresponsibly Denigrate' KGB

PM1310091989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Oct 89 Second Edition p 6

[V. Loktev article: "Seconds Lasting 100 Days"]

[Excerpts] On the day before he was in a good mood. After 3 months of crisscrossing the country it seemed that he had managed to cover his tracks and could at last relax and take a breather. Here, in the capital with its millions of people, it is easy to lose yourself, to dissolve into the crowd and bide your time until better times come. Especially since in Chertanovo he had a comfortable apartment at his disposal—his pals had looked after him. He thought that everything had been taken care of and for that reason felt completely safe; he even brought his wife and child from Tomsk and invited his friends around.

It was 11 September. Yadgar Saidov, a well-known godfather in the criminal world, who was under investigation, was about to take a break from "business", not suspecting that within a few hours the cold metal handcuffs would snap shut on his wrists. [passage omitted]

I admit that when I went to the KGB that Saturday I was counting on a thorough and unhurried conversation with all the exciting details typical of a detective story. Unfortunately it did not live up to my expectations. In the first place, there was regular ringing of the telephone in the office of Vladimir Vasilyevich Lutsenko, leader of a subunit at the KGB's recently created directorate for the protection of the Soviet constitutional system. In the second place, he was a man of unusually few words. A number of times he cited presumption of innocence, which stopped him from developing his thoughts on Saidov's "activities" very far, and broke off his terse monologues with phrases of the type: "It is too early to talk about that yet" or "in principle this isn't so important." [passage omitted]

But let us return to the "hero" of our story. Why had the KGB become involved in his investigation and arrest?

"The operations and investigation reports," Lutsenko explained, "enabled us to presume that Saidov was one of the organizers of the hooligan mobs and criminal elements in Fergana. During the investigation of a number of criminal cases connected with the disorders in that region we received information that he had instigated pogroms in places where Meskhetian Turks live and urged the crowd to take up arms. In the light of this information a decision was made to take Saidov's investigation and arrest under KGB control.

That isn't all. Some people wanted to see in the Fergana tragedy the existence of intrigues organized by a single underground center pursuing political goals and coordinating the events. I can state with the utmost responsibility that this was nothing of the kind.

Describing the organizational-technical and operational aspects of the investigation, V. Lutsenko punctuated his account now and again with the words: "Don't be offended but this is off the record." But why should I take offense, it was understandable: Chekists must have their professional secrets. That is sometimes what gives the KGB organs' work its effectiveness but they do not let you show in detail (again in the interests of all honest people) the full mechanism of this "mysterious organization," as the zealous advocates of unrestricted glasnost say. In meeting my interlocutor's wishes the only thing that I can say for certain is that for 3 months chekists in Moscow, Fergana, and Tomsk carried out a vast amount of work analyzing in detail several dozen volumes of Saidov's criminal activities, elucidating his criminal links in the country, and performing around-the-clock duty at airports and places where he might possibly be. You can't describe all of it. [passage omitted]

...In the subway I opened issue 37 of ARGUMENTY I FAKTY. There was a short item entitled "Is the KGB profitable?" There was a letter from A. Andreyev, a reader from Perm, followed by a commentary from a KGB general.

A. Andreyev's opinion on this state department and its staffers seemed to me peremptory to say the least, but the tone was simply insulting.

However, judge for yourselves. Here is the letter in question. "I believe that glasnost has left the KGB completely untouched. I see the reason for that not in the fact that the department is secretive but in the fact that under cover of this infamous secrecy it is possible to spend billions of the people's money unsupervised without working particularly hard for it. It is clearly for that reason that there are hardly any reports in the press on successful operations in the struggle against the mafia or foreign intelligence services. I think that the time has come for a radical reduction of those 400,000 idlers who have made themselves a cozy niche in that department."

You could really take offense at that. Words such as "infamous secrecy," "idlers," and "cozy niche"... Everyone tarred with the same brush. People such as Lutsenko and those who come under bandits' fire but who keep out of the picture and who of late, it is true, have featured regularly if anonymously in central press reports under the rubric "At the USSR KGB." The outwardly unspectacular work of the chekists (how else could it be?!) which involves if not daily risk then

certainly frequent risk to their health and life is thus assessed in this superficial manner.

Unlike the author of the letter in that popular weekly, I am not going to pass full judgment on the workload of all "400,000" of them. Instead it would be more apt to give an account of the specific results of recent KGB involvement in the campaign against organized crime:

Moscow. The trial of a group of smugglers consisting of 11 Soviet and foreign citizens has ended. The criminals were sentenced to long terms of imprisonment. During the investigation assets worth R1,153,000 were confiscated from them and given to the state.

Tashkent. Military counterintelligence and agents and staffers of the KGB and the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic Ministry of Internal Affairs arrested some robbers who had murdered two sentries belonging to a military unit stationed in Tashkent. They proved to be three locals. During the interrogation they stated that they had planned to use weapons that they had seized to commit other crimes, in particular crimes involving racketeering.

Torzhok. Staffers of the KGB administration in Kalinin Oblast neutralized a five-man gang who had been engaged in robbery, blackmail, and extortion for a long time. The criminals, marked by their particular audacity and brutality, had been terrorizing the inhabitants of the town.

Voronezh. The Voronezh Oblast KGB administration has completed the investigation into the case of A. Zapevalov and others (seven people in all), who are charged with murdering two women, organizing an armed gang for the purpose of attacking militia staffers and military servicemen to steal their weapons and attack and rob enterprises, institutions, and citizens and of preparing to hijack a plane. The case has been sent to the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Court.

I agree that we did not used to write much about the KGB, but was it alone in being treated in that way? This organization has its problems and shortcomings which do not tally at all with the idea of the organization's "omnipotence." Take air tickets. Saidov, for example, was able to supply them with no difficulty, whereas state security staffers can only sometimes do this with the help of their superiors. Their pay, incidentally, is no higher than that of ordinary army officers but their working day is open-ended.

One last point. You cannot cope with crime using the forces of the law enforcement organs alone, of course, even with the active participation of the KGB. The causes of crime have to be eradicated. That goes without saying. But there is another point which, in my view, is indisputable: Even through ignorance one cannot irresponsibly denigrate the people and agencies engaged in protecting our society and each one of us from the encroachments of Saidov and his ilk and safeguarding our life, honor, and human dignity.

Railways Minister Withdraws Suit Against Deputy

PM1310132589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Oct 89 Second Edition p 2

[Letter from USSR Minister of Railways N.S. Konarev and USSR People's Deputy S.N. Khadzhiyev under the rubric "Following Publication in PRAVDA": "Reconciled"]

[Text] In its 27 August issue, PRAVDA published an article entitled "Lawsuit, or How Minister Nikolay Semenovich Konarev and People's Deputy Salambek Naibovich Khadzhiyev Fell Out." We deem it necessary to announce that we have resolved the conflict without intervention by the courts.

Guided by peace-loving feelings and with due consideration for the apologies offered by S.N. Khadzhiyev for the form of his statement in the presence of people's deputies and members of the USSR Supreme Soviet 25 September, N.S. Konarev withdrew the lawsuit application.

As regards the criticism of the Ministry of Railways by S.N. Khadzhiyev and other people's deputies concerning the poor quality of passenger service, this problem does indeed exist. The ministry, railroads, and railroad workers' labor collectives are making great efforts to improve the quality of railroad services. But they will have to be considerably augmented for the sake of Soviet people's justified demands.

[Signed] N.S. Konarev
S.N. Khadzhiyev

Through Traffic on BAM Route Noted

LD1510094189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0700 GMT 15 Oct 89

[Text] Construction of the whole route with stations at junctions on the Chita section of BAM has been completed 3 months earlier than planned. The last stage of railway in the neighboring Amur oblast has been also put into permanent operation. The opening of the through regular train traffic from Baykal to the Pacific coast will relieve the eastern sections of the Trans-Siberian railway, complete its electrification, and cut down the schedule of passenger transportation and conveyance of national economy goods by 2 days.

People's Deputies Answer Students' Questions

LD0110221689

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1940 GMT on 29 September carries an 80-minute recorded program in which USSR People's Deputies

answer questions from a studio audience comprised of economics and journalism students from Moscow State University.

The program is presented by Aleksandr Lyubimov, Vladislav Listyev, and Dmitriy Zakharov. The panel taking questions is comprised of Sergey Belozertsev, Aleksandr Maksimovich Yakovlev, Viktor Yaroshenko, and Yevgeniy Golovlev. The panel takes both questions from the audience and from phone calls. None of the questioners are named.

The first topic of discussion are the rights and opportunities of the deputies. Listyev says when the Congress of People's Deputies began many people had mixed feelings of hope and disappointment, and that one would very much like to see great powers invested in the deputies. Listyev says that practice shows, however, that the deputies have freedom of speech and opportunities to legislate but that these do not necessarily ensure measures taken will be quickly implemented. Listyev says it is "still unclear what the status and powers of a people's deputy are and what the Supreme Soviet and congress can do to get their decisions implemented."

Deputy Sergey Belozertsev, a candidate of philosophical sciences, is introduced. He is asked several questions pertaining to draft laws. To a question on what channels a draft law goes through before it reaches the deputies, Belosertsev says, "There was mention at the first session of the Supreme Soviet of a bill on the introduction of a state of emergency." Belosertsev says he looked into this, asked for a copy, only to be told that it was at the CPSU Central Committee for revision. He notes both the Central Committee and the obkoms have now set up state legal departments. He regards this as illegal, "whereas formerly, the party organs interfered with the legal process without having any sort of basis for it, now they evidently want to provide themselves with such a basis, including a legal one."

Belozertsev then answers a few questions on how the Supreme Soviet will defend deputies' rights. He is also asked, "since the 10th congress, the word 'faction' has been considered a term of abuse. If you were president or general secretary, would you approve of the creation of factions within the Supreme Soviet?" Belozertsev says different viewpoints are needed as are different groups. He says the party would die if there were not groups within it.

Next an unidentified questioner says, "We have been told for a long time that we live in the most free country and enjoy the most extensive rights. How can we say how free we are unless we compare our own situation with that of others? By no means every 'free Soviet citizen' can exercise the right to enter and leave the country, a right which is contained in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. We cannot sell our apartments or give them away, even if it is a cooperative. If you have a car, you cannot, for example, paint it a different color if you feel like it. God forbid you should get your hands on a Xerox or similar duplication machine, which is freely on sale even in the developing countries!

"The deputies are busy drawing up more and more new laws, decisions and codes, which are undoubtedly necessary but people are still living in apartments they do not own. Much that is part of everyday law for the peoples of other countries remains, for us, an unrealizable dream. If changes for the better are happening in our country, what are they?" The question is not answered. [video shows militiaman helping someone, militiaman treating someone roughly; procurator's office and other legal buildings; demonstrators with placard: 'No' to a new Tbilisi on the Arbat; cars, newspapers. Stall of author who is his own publisher and seller; his book "explains why we live badly."

Next a voice-over introduces Alexsandr Yakovlev, 61-year old doctor of law. Yakovlev says he has mixed feelings about being a deputy, noting that it gives him a chance to exert a real influence in changing the legal system but has so far brought him nothing but extra work. The presenter Zakharov notes, "May we remind you that the opinions of our guests do not always correspond with the opinions of the program. So, questions on law to the lawyer Aleksandr Yakovlev."

Yakovlev is asked why there is Constitution, but no consitutional court. Yakovlev replies "Briefly, our Constitution retains the main features of the 1936 Constitution, though it was formally re-adopted in 1977. I will venture to assert that it is basically the same Constitution. That Constitution was adopted in the heady days when the Constitution proclaimed the inviolability of the person. It declared, 'all power to the Soviets!' So, the fictional nature of the Constitution is an integral feature of the period we have lived through, and in a certain sense the fictitiousness of a number of the norms of the Constitution remains to this day. The strongest law is nothing if reality is so far divorced from it that it becomes simply a form of legislatively formulated lying. What can we do to make the Constitution work? That is precisely what is needed. We need a special body, answering to the people, which would measure everything that happens in the country against the constitutional norm, and say, when it contradicts the norm, 'no, that will not happen, that must not happen!' and would nip in the bud and abolish that which contradicts the Constitution. We have no such body at the present time. The main point is that a mass of laws has already been published, and they may even pass through a highly flexible Supreme Soviet; and then we find the constitutional norm has been paralyzed, or the Council of Ministers has issued something which simply reduces the constitutional norm to nothing. There are a huge number of such decisions. I advocate that our Supreme Court, and the supreme courts of the union republics, should act as constitutional watchdogs. I will be proposing that idea."

Yakovlev is next asked questions about the rights of teenagers. He says that the more young adults keep a

high profile, the more real will be their rights. Yakovlev is then asked, "Aleksandr Maksimovich, as far as I know, a commission was set up to revise the 1977 Constitution. What will it have to say about the legislative acts which periodically exclude the operation of the constitutional laws?" Yakovlev answers "You know, I happen to be a member of that very important commission, but so far I have never once sat on it. Perhaps no sessions have taken place, or I have not been called. I can only tell you what I think it should do." The audience laughs and applauds. Yakovlev says, "That I can tell you, very briefly." Yakovlev is interrupted by the next question and does not return to answer further on the topic of the Constition's revision.

A questioner says many people consider the decisions of the first session of the USSR Supreme Soviet on combating crime to be clearly inadequate for radically changing the situation. He asks about Yakovlev's attitude toward this problem. Yakovlev says he doesn't recall any serious acts being passed at the first session of the Supreme Soviet of the sort that would help the fight against crime. He says further, "If you have in mind the appeal, the last appeal, that is really more of a call to arms, as it were. It contains no real changes of a normative character. Moreover, it does contain the very incorrect notion that the courts must apply maximally severe measures of punishment. That's terrible! The courts must apply just measures of punishment, and not maximal measures of punishment. So nothing serious was adopted at the first session. But we are now on the eve of the introduction of serious innovations in the field of criminal and social legislation."

Yakovlev next talks about the scarcity of lawyers among his colleagues in parliament. He is asked about his suggestion that young people should hold meetings to defend their interests. The questioner says, "In our country, however, meetings are sanctioned (sanktsionirovany). How does this relate to the building of advanced socialism?" Yakovlev says meetings should be registered, noting "You should have to register beforehand the time the meeting is to be held, and if there are no grounds to refuse registration, it should take place."

Yakovlev is next asked what he thinks of the fact that an assessment of the work of the group which investigated the case of Ivanov was given at a CPSU Central Committee plenum before the final examination of the matter by the commission set up by the USSR Supreme Soviet. Yakovlev replies, "I think your question ought, of course, to have been addressed to those who organized this at the plenum and held the hearing. As I see it, until a court has legally passed sentence on a person accused of a criminal offense, all measures directed toward interpreting the facts of the case are premature. Mind you, though, it is a habit with us that as soon as a communist is prosecuted, we first expel him from the party, and only afterward start looking into the question of his guilt or innocence."

Yakovlev next answers a question on legal rights and is then asked if the right to leave the country, to study or to work, will be granted in the future to only a select few or to "every citizen of the Soviet Union" to avail himself of the opportunity at his wish. Yakovlev says the only obstacle to leaving the country concerns the requirements of state security as firmly defined by law.

Listyev brings up the discussion of the economy after noting to the audience that the talk show is an arena of pluralism, and the viewpoint of the deputies may not always correspond to the viewpoint of the program.

The economic discussion resumes after a video clip of sparsely-stocked shelves, then a video clip of M.S. Gorbachev addressing deputies. The voice-over says, "The economic crisis is today a favorite subject of domestic conversation. When people meet at work, they eagerly discuss what has disappeared from the shops this time. Few people doubt that our troubles have been brought about by an economic mechanism which in more than half a century has not once given proof of its advantages. Today it is no more viable than a patient whose heartbeats are being maintained by electric shocks. Attempts to make good the budget deficit (?endlessly at the expense of) the have-nots and by increasing taxation threaten to make the ruble cheaper than wrapping paper and strangle our already cautious economic initiatives. The economic situation is in the focus of attention of the people's deputies. Not a few fine ideas and pious wishes are being pronounced from the rostrum, but where are the results? For millions of people from whose memories the outward appearance of sausage and soap is gradually being erased, the question remains open."

Viktor Yaroshenko, candidate of economic sciences, is next introduced. He is asked about ruble convertibility and taxation.

To a question about the positive and negative consequences of free economic zones, he replies that mixed enterprises have so far had little effect. He says "More radical measures are needed. We must do away with ownerless property, then we will solve our economic problems. You go along the road. On the right are the fields of a collective farm, on the left, garden allotments. On the left, abundance; on the right, a semi-desert. That is the cause of our economic problems. In the USA, the 4 percent of the population engaged in agriculture feed the country. They sell to us. God forbid they should have a poor harvest, in our country a famine would begin. We must solve the question of property."

A questioner next asks, "You were Yeltsin's agent (doverennoye litso). Was his visit to the United States difficult?"

Yaroshenko replies, "well, I was not his agent, I was perhaps his economic adviser." He notes further, "The purpose of the visit, there were several purposes. The first was to acquaint the American public with the progress of perestroyka. The lectures that were given there were actually entitled 'Perestroyka yesterday,

today, and tomorrow.' The second task was contacts with U.S. politicians, the presidents—they do not call them ex-presidents. Reagan is also a president—the vice-presidents, the secretary of state, the senators and so on. The third task was to solve a number of economic problems: the attempt to attract U.S. capital for building a million apartments in the USSR; the attempts to attract American farmers to bring into use a million hectares of uncultivated land, for example to grow soya. The attempt to get a regime of most-favoured nation. We held negotiations on the opening of a securities exchange in Moscow, and the issue of stock. It is very interesting that in the United States, 10,000 enterprises belong to those who work in them, in other words, it is a new form of collective ownership." Yaroshenko next replies to questions on student grants, collective farms, and leasing.

A questioner asks, "As far as I know, no one has cancelled the building of socialism in our country. Nevertheless, the socialist law of distribution according to labor is not in operation. What do you think is the reason? Is it not a law, or is it not socialism?" The audience applauds.

Yaroshenko says, "I think there are a number of objective laws. You can neither invent nor abolish them. The law of cost, it is objective. We abolished it, it is supposed to have ceased to operate, and now we're reaping the fruits. These are laws that we have to observe more strictly than the laws of the criminal code. Take the law of gravity. Try abolishing it. Try to fly from the roof and jump to the moon. You'll fall and be smashed. The same has happened with our economy: we abolished objective laws and thought up imaginary ones in the name of political demagogy, and now we are reaping the fruits."

A questioner says an unprecedented attack is now being made on the cooperatives and asks if a decision been made to get rid of them once and for all. Yaroshenko says, "It is not the cooperatives we should fight against, but speculation and organized crime. The present fight against the cooperatives in the Supreme Soviet is a mistake.

A question is put to Yaroshenko: "Returning to your visit to the United States with Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, as we know, the Supreme Soviet session has now set up a five-man commission to examine that flagrant article in PRAVDA about your visit. What documents do you want to submit to that commission for investigation and examination?"

Yaroshenko asks for more than 2 minutes to reply, but is refused, and replies: "OK. After Boris Nikolayevich left to attend the plenum, I and [word indistinct] (Alferenko) stayed behind to carry out an independent inquiry into what had happened. First of all, we found a number of inaccuracies in the article: Yeltsin never met Brzezinski—as far as the deputies are concerned I met him. With Eisenhower and Harriman—those were meetings that I had, not Yeltsin. Second, I demanded an interview with the bookkeeper whom the paper quotes, and who allegedly confirmed Yeltsin's expenditures. Yeltsin only once went to a food shop, where there were 30,000 food items on sale and which is open 24 hours a day, without days off and without lunch breaks. He was shaken by this. And instead of that, we get this disinformation: video machines, cassettes, and so on. I established that the bookkeeper doesn't exist. When we gave denials to THE NEW YORK TIMES and THE WASHINGTON POST, (?they) invited Jack Anderson, the well-known observer who took part in the unravelling of Watergate.

"He has his own column in 150 newspapers. He double-checked everything, and denials appeared in all the papers the next day. After that, the Italians invited (?him) to appear on television. A cross-examination began, and the moment of truth came. He said it had been disinformation, it had been planted on him [yemu yeye podkinuli]; he'd never set eyes on Yeltsin or heard him, he was very sorry, he'd obtained it second hand. So that's it. Later these materials were backed up by other press organs."

The next subject in the program is the balance of power. Video is shown of a women reading the Yeltsin interview in paper; streets; marchers with placards of Lenin and Gorbachev; limousines; a book, "Social Problems of Perestroyka," and the cover of USSR Constitution. The voice-over says: "The right to power: From ancient times this has been one of the most acute issues. Who has the right to dispose of the destinies of millions of people? How is such power acquired? The experience of our own country shows that a monopoly of power turns the population into hostages of those who possess it. Declared promises to concern themselves with the good of the people have been given by hundreds of rulers in all times, but few of them have ever answered for their unfulfilled promises. The credits taken from the people and not repaid for centuries can be endless. Over recent time, past mistakes have been admitted; but not once has the question been raised of responsibility for the political and economic structures that have inflicted enormous damage on the people and the country. How will the structures of power take shape in the future? How will the balance of powers be distributed among the party and soviet bodies? And how will that machinery work in the future?"

The program briefly profiles Yevgeniy Golovlev, doctor of biological sciences, professor. The voice over continues "Yevgeniy Golovlev's article in MOSOVSKIYE NOVOSTI on the party's responsibility for power has had a big impact on the public." A question is put to Golovlev: "Has not the revolution been an elementary usurpation of the power of the party, because as far as is now becoming known, the workers started to strike only four months after the revolution."

Golovlev replies "Our revolution did not happen as Marx intended. The revolution took place separately in one country, and in the least [as heard] economically backward country. So the revolution predetermined in

some degree our path to totalitarianism." The next question asks: "There is much talk now of the growing role of the Party at the present stage. Practice has shown that this has always led to an intensification of the power of the party apparatus. Don't you think that the important thing now is to limit that power, and what real chance is there of doing so under a one-party system?"

Golovlev states "Power in our country is Soviet power. And from that standpoint the Party ought not, strictly speaking, to have the power. The Party ought to be the vehicle of communist ideology. It does indeed need to increase its role at the present time, but as the vehicle of communist ideology and not as a power structure."

Another question is put: "One of the great ones has said that a multiparty system is primarily a vaccination against fascism. What has a multiparty system to offer in our conditions?"

Golovlev replies "A multiparty system is not a settled state of affairs. A multiparty system arises through a lengthy process. It's a process from—which probably lasts, to go by the experience of the Western countries, about 100 or 150 years, during which the state functions with some sort of two-party system. A multiparty set-up in our system now—I don't know whether we'll somehow manage to hold on within the framework of a one-party system. In our conditions, a multiparty set-up would bring us to a pretty complicated correlation of political forces and to a situation in which the main social groups have yet to formulate their political platform. And we'll go that way, persistently and for as long as it takes, till we arrive at the multiparty system that we like so much in the most developed countries."

Golovlev is then asked: "We now have a fairly good idea of the balance of power in the Supreme Soviet, thanks to the live broadcasts of the session. Why have we still not seen a single session of the Politburo?"

Golovlev answers: "Well, you know, you've probably read the materials of the two plenums of the Central Committee, the April plenum and the recent one. So if you've read them, you know why we—I personally am not happy about the level of discussion of the issues that were voiced especially at the April plenum. I think that is clearly understood. For myself, I think that in our party bodies there's a certain element of confusion and of lack of insight into the political situation."

A questioner returns to the issue of the multiparty system: "Yevgeniy Leonidovich, a multiparty system has been talked about in our country for a long time. And among the impossible—or rather, among the reasons for its impossibility—the one that used to be mentioned was historical conditions. Now they say it would intensify the polarity of our society. Could you tell us whether the negative attitude of the functionaries in the Party isn't simply due to their reluctance to give up power?"

Golovlev replies: "The fact is, well I don't know that it's reluctance exactly. It's in our blood. I have here a reaction to an article in a local paper—hmm, this conviction that if the Party lets go of the reins, chaos will begin in the country and the state will cease to exist. This element, the element of the Party's lack of confidence in its own people, is a surprising element, really. But unfortunately the old Party cadres are afflicted by this. Well, but the apparatus, naturally. Something is now being formulated, the main thesis of which is that we must achieve political stability and economic stability at all costs. Who can be the guarantor of such stability? Answer: The Party. And I suppose it may really be the Party, because we can't rely on the trade unions, and those who are in opposition in our country now; they seem to have localized themselves and somehow repelled a great many forces that could support perestroyka, the Party, for example—but not in the condition it's in at present. The main task now, from my point of view, is to reform the Party. The party must become aware of itself."

A question is put on the CPSU's role: "Yevgeniy Leonidovich, our Constitution says that the CPSU is the guiding and leading force. But can one declare that without holding a special referendum of the people? After all, the Party's only a fourteenth of the population."

Golovlev states: "No, no. You can't. Although I don't know how to hold such a referendum. What percentage to you have to have to get an answer? Is 51 percent enough, or not? I don't know. But in any case there must be a referendum, in any case it must be the people's conclusion."

A questioner asks: "Many of the communist parties of the socialist countries are now going through a crisis. Do you think a split in the CPSU is possible?"

Golovlev replies: "Split—I don't know what you'd describe as a split. That various positions of some kind are bound to be formed in the CPSU is it's salvation. In contradistinction to what's been said at the April plenum, I consider that the CPSU ought now to become a debating society. One should be afraid of nothing—not even factions."

A viewer asks why Golovlev, a biologist, is concerning himself with problems of party construction and the balance of power. Golovlev replies he is not only a biologist, but a Party veteran, too; he's a practical man, not a theoretician.

Golovlev is then asked: "How, in your view, can the democratic minority be turned into a democratic majority at the upcoming elections of people's deputies, and is it a realistic possibility?"

Golovlev replies: "In any—the fact is that I don't think the real correlation of political forces in the country is as shown by the Congress. I think the minority could have a lot more if they employed more realistic, more flexible

and more sensible tactics. Their group didn't have enough apparatchiks who understand matters of tactics."

A question is put on state posts: "How do you feel about the fact that the leading posts in the state are held, as a rule, by members of the party? People quite often join the party only because, well, it brings them certain privileges, promotion and so on."

Golovlev states: "I think the fundamental and cardinal mistake is Gorbachev's thesis that our Party is the ruling Party. Under a one-party system, the Party cannot be the ruling Party on the analogy of what a ruling party is in the West. If it's the ruling Party, it has the right to propose and use it apparatus for the leading posts. If it's the political vanguard of the whole of society, then it must rely above all on the non-Party members. If it's trying to play the part of the head, it must rest on the body formed by the non-Party members."

Very brief answers are then squeezed into the last 5 minutes of the program:

A questioner asks: "When will a well-illustrated magazine about the social life of the deputies finally be published? Or shall we go on using reprints from Western sources?" Ivashenko replies by deploring the Soviet habit of reprinting gossip from Western magazines.

Another questioner says: "Isn't it time we gave up our illusions of building a communist society in our country?" To laughter, Belozertsev replies: "Everyone has his own idea of communism. The primititve communism we've built, you can see for yourselves. Under Stalin we lived in a barrack-room communism. In other words, where there is illusion, one must see it for what it is."

A questioner wonders about history and current assessments: "The opinion exists that one should renounce all historical authorities, historical canons. What should we do if we have to adhere to the opinion of our contemporaries? What opinion should we adhere to, and where is the criterion of assessment?" Yakovlev's answer is: "Decide for yourselves!"

Then a questioner expounds on economic models: "In most countries, economic models that have not justified themselves are replaced. With us, the economic model of absolute state ownership has been demonstrating its unsoundness for 70 years. Isn't it time to give the people a chance to live normally at last?" Yakovlev says there should be pluralism of ownership, and this is just what is already being proposed.

Finally, a questioner asks Yakovlev about power: "In reality, Comrade Yakovlev, who has more real power in the country—the CPSU Central Committee, or the USSR Supreme Soviet?"

Yakovlev replies: "As I see it, the real power is in the hands of whoever disposes of people, money and resources. Whoever disposes of these in reality possesses the power in the country. So draw your own conclusion: Who in our country disposes of the people, the money and the resources? In practice, not on paper?"

Doubts Voiced About Economic Accountability

PM1909104789 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 13 Sep 89 Second Edition p 2

[Interview with participants in first (constituent) congress of United Front of Working People of Russia by correspondent A. Gamov under the rubric "Following the Event": "Along the Path of Consolidation"; place, date not specified; first paragraph is SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA introduction]

[Text] The first (constituent) congress of the United Front of Working People of Russia was held in Sverdlovsk 8-9 September. Some 110 delegates representing labor collectives in 29 cities of the Russian Federation and also emissaries of the international movements and working people's fronts of Moldavia, Tajikistan, Latvia, and Estonia participated in its work. Our correspondent talks with congress participants—V.A. Yarin, people's deputy, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and rolling mill operator at Nizhniy Tagil Metallurgical Combine; Doctor of Philosophical Sciences M.V. Popov, senior lecturer at Leningrad State University; K.V. Fedotov, dock worker at Leningrad Commercial Seaport; and Candidate of Philosophical Sciences V.M. Yakushev, senior lecturer at the USSR Council of Ministers Academy of the National Economy.

[Gamov] I would like, first of all, to know the reason for convening your congress.

[Yarin] The chief reason was to create the United Front of Working People of Russia. But it would not be out of place to remind you that the congress met soon after the end of the Sixth All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions [AUCCTU] Plenum, which adopted cardinal decisions aimed at further galvanizing the activity of our trade unions. It was then that an appeal was made for working people to pool their efforts in defense of their rights and interests.

[Popov] In general, the idea of creating a Russian united front of working people arose even earlier. As is known, the constituent congress of the United Front of Working People of the Soviet Union was held in Leningrad last July. It was then that this question arose: Why is there not a similar public organization in Russia? For the success of the entire perestroyka largely depends on whether Russia's working people are able to tackle the resolution of the most burning social and economic tasks.

[Yakushev] I would like to draw attention also to the following point. As you know, the interests of workers are represented in the country's Supreme Soviet by an insignificant number of deputies. It was in order to somehow rectify this defect that working people decided to unite and to help perestroyka. Hence the very rapid

development of our movement, which is founded on an alliance of workers, peasantry, and intelligentsia—all who are struggling actively to improve the lives of ordinary people.

[Fedotov] SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA has reported the initiative of the United Front of Working People of Leningrad to hold elections of local soviet people's deputies in accordance with not only the territorial principle but also the production principle. Then the AUCCTU and our oblast trade union council held an extraordinary working meeting on this topic, which threw up the proposal to convene a congress of the United Front of Working People of Russia.

[Gamov] The "Leningrad model" for local soviet elections has given rise to much dispute. What assessment did your congress make of it?

[Fedotov] We are pleased that there has, at last, been a serious discussion of our idea. It is interesting that during the debate those comrades who had previously been voicing some doubts about "production okrugs" openly declared that we had succeeded in convincing them. We were supported, in particular, by representatives of the Urals People's Front. And many people saw that this is a vital idea that must be realized in practice. It was no coincidence that the Sixth AUCCTU Plenum adopted a decision to put before the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet Presidium a proposal to hold elections to local organs of power in Russia in accordance with the production-territorial principle. And at our congress we proposed that the Russian Federation's working people support our idea of holding elections from enterprises and organizations so that workers can, at last, gain direct access to power and participate in the discussion and adoption of very important state decisions.

[Yakushev] Incidentally, many people were doubtful: They wondered whether some voters might not turn out to have more votes than others. The congress gave a perfectly clear and precise answer to this question: Everyone will be accorded equal opportunities. Because the elections—if, of course, our version is adopted—will be held first in production and then in territorial okrugs. Each rayon and each locality can resolve in its own way the question of the ratio in which the deputies of the two okrugs will be represented on the soviets. This is why the final resolution adopted by the congress does not provide for any strict or specific proportions in this regard.

[Popov] It is significant that the congress adopted a decision to organize elections of working people's deputies to enterprise and organization councils. If we begin these preliminary elections right now, we will thereby prepare people for a new election campaign. The existing model for future elections will, I believe, make it possible to avoid many mistakes.

[Fedotov] Mindful of the importance of the question, the congress adopted a separate resolution "On Strengthening Working People's Power" and an appeal to labor collectives in respect of elections of deputies to enterprise councils. Incidentally, the proposed procedure for local soviet elections in production okrugs gives labor collectives the right to nominate as candidate deputies jurists, writers, and scientists—that is, all citizens who best champion their interests.

[Gamov] As far as I know, purely economic problems also occupied a large place in the work of your congress...

[Yakushev] I do not think there is any need to demonstrate why we are all so concerned about Russia's economic situation. Many people pointed out at the congress that the reform which is being implemented gives advantages at present not to workers but to all sorts of artful dodgers, rogues, and cheats, and this arouses the greatest indignation in people. This was mentioned, in particular, by representatives of the workers' committees of Vorkuta, the Kuzbass...

It was rightly pointed out at the congress that if we gamble on deepening quite uncontrolled market relations in the economy, then the situation in the country will exacerbate even further. I also believe that, if we go over to regional economic accountability, each regional formation may confine itself to its own interests. And it cannot be ruled out, if that happens, that the country will face a phased dismemberment into a number of small state formations, which, in the final analysis, could easily be made dependent on international monopolies.

Unfortunately, as the congress pointed out, there is a gradual slide in just this direction. At first we were told that the first model of economic accountability would be effective, then the second, and then, so it turned out, the third model—the lease—was the most perfect. And now it is said that the fourth model—the transfer of enterprises to ownership by labor collectives—is "the mostest..." Then, logically, it has to be supposed that fixed capital will be converted into private property. Because the labor collective's property is shares, which can be concentrated in single hands, and then the enterprise will become someone's private possession.

[Popov] [13 September First Edition of SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA attributes this paragraph to Yakushev] Workers have understood and perceived intuitively something that some of our leading economists just cannot grasp: Profit is the expression of that part of the product that maintains the nonproductive sections of society. Therefore, if the economy is only profit-oriented, as it is now, it infringes workers' interests. The congress spoke about the need to reorient the economy from profit indicators to indicators which reflect the level of satisfaction of the needs of the population and society.

[Both editions attribute the following paragraph to Popov] It seems to me that the question of improving the planning system was also posed correctly. Certain economists go so far as to say that it is obsolete and that market levers must be set in motion. Only it is not a matter of the system but of how we use it....

[Yakushev] I would like to cite this point, which was also made at the congress: Our economic system now resembles someone who looks in a distorting mirror and sees himself distorted but who, instead of changing the mirror, begins reshaping his physiognomy. And we are doing the same thing: Instead of elaborating a system of indicators which would reflect the real movement of the social product of labor, we are beginning to break up the system itself.

[Popov] Today much is being said about economic accountability. When it was demonstrated to us that prices were rising because the interests of the matter required it, at first everyone perceived that explanation with understanding. But now people no longer want food and soap to vanish from the counters for the sake of economic accountability, or granulated sugar to disappear....

[Yarin] There is a city—Nizhniy Tagil, whose interests I represent. It is a city enmeshed in the coupon system and oppressed by scarcity. And it is a pity that nothing is changing even after our appearance at the 19th party conference, the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, and the Supreme Soviet session. We are dogged by constant shortages. Under such conditions we have to draw up survival programs. And these are misfortunes not only for Nizhniy Tagil but for our entire republic. The question was raised directly at the congress of the United Front of Working People: We must find a way out of this complex situation. And we will find it.

[Popov] I would like to talk about the indicators toward which our economy and economic accountability must be reoriented. It was stated at the congress that we must direct it, above all, toward lowering prices. The chief indicator for all enterprises which produce consumer goods must be not profit but the sum of the reduction in the prices of products. At present we pay bonuses only for a rise in prices. And in accordance with the reform this produces wages growth. So enterprises act according to the principle: It is better to produce less, but more expensively.

[Fedotov] The congress manifested total disagreement with the practice whereby members of pseudocooperatives get rich. The demands made at the Sixth AUCCTU Plenum that "speculatives" be closed down were echoed at the congress of the United Front of Working People of Russia. We believe that cooperative members must be sold raw materials at the state price, so that they do not hike their prices, saying that the raw materials are expensive. Finally, deductions from income must be the same as for state enterprises. But, unfortunately, working people in state organs still heed the voice of cooperative members more than the demands of the ordinary person. This was mentioned with alarm at the congress, and we must secure the resolution of this question at all costs.

[Gamov] You have said nothing about the atmosphere that prevailed at and around the congress....

[Yakushev] Of course, the congress organizers did not doubt that there would be some resistance, that there would be people who would start putting spokes in our wheels. At first, attempts were made to stop our congress from being held. At the last stage, when the invitations to delegates and guests had been sent out, the responsible comrade in charge of organizing this measure suddenly transferred our request for hotel places to deputies from an interregional group who were holding a session in parallel with our congress. We had to lodge in a hostel. [13 Sep First Edition adds the following: And, of course, we had not supposed that Academician Sakharov would rush to the Urals. Was that not in order to participate in the movement to torpedo the congress of the United Front of Working People of Russia?]

[Fedotov] I want to emphasize that at the congress we gave the floor to all the people's deputies in the interregional group who wished to speak. But when representatives of the congress went to that group's session and asked for 1 minute to make a report, they were refused.

[Yarin] It seems to me that all this stems from a lack of understanding. We should all meet together and honestly answer the question: What is happening around us today? What can each of us do to make the people's life easier? But no, what we see is some kind of confrontation, which nobody needs. Instead of investigating what is what, they gave our association a hostile reception and tried to label us the creation of some apparatus. They want a discussion? Let's have one, only in an honest way.

[Popov] And yet I believe that our congress succeeded. Once again we saw for ourselves that it is not beyond the capability of ordinary mortals. Ordinary workers who, at first, perhaps, were timid then conducted the congress splendidly and spoke in a businesslike way. They proved once again that, if they tackle anything, they are sure to see it through to the end. And it is no coincidence that right after the end of the congress members of the coordinating council—workers and engineering and technical personnel—began thinking about how to advance further the process of consolidating the forces of all working people and how to help them to become true fighters for perestroyka.

Magazines' Editors Answer Readers' Questions

LD2409033889

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1255 GMT on 19 September carries a 45-minute recorded program entitled "History and the Present: Meeting With the Editorial Board of the VOPROSY ISTORII Magazine," presented by journalist Galina Ulyanova. Ulyanova explains that the meeting between the editors of the magazine and its readers is taking place in the Reading Room of the Lenin Library and goes on the introduce Akhmed Akhmedovich Iskenderov, editor-in-chief of VOPROSY ISTORII, and corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences. Iskenderov proceeds to explain that the editors hold these meetings

with their readers regularly, and that these meetings, by providing feedback, help to determine the "profile of the magazine".

Iskenderov outlines for the audience the broad principles according to which the magazine operates and how the magazine "takes part in the restructuring process currently taking place" in Soviet society. "Over this and next year the magazine hopes to publish Nikita Sergeyevich Krushchev's memoirs in their entirety. Khrushchev's son, Sergey Nikitovich, who is present, will speak about the memoirs later. Next year the magazine will also publish profiles of Stolypin and Trotsky, as well as Trotsky's work 'Stalin's School of Falsification'." Iskenderov suggests that they should start the meeting with a question and answer session.

In response to this a member of the audience, who introduces himself as reader (Atamanov), announces that there is an initiative group of readers present in the room and they ask the editors to publish their demands, which include changing state libraries to public libraries, the immediate and complete opening of all special stocks, provision of full and equal access to all materials for all readers, the immediate publication of all works by Solzhenitsyn, and the placing of these works on library shelves "side-by-side with the works of Marx and Lenin, so that everyone can compare words with deeds for themselves," putting an end to the "theft of Russian literature by customs officials and militia, and the return of already stolen works to their owners." Throughout his contribution there are shouted objections from the audience that this is not a question and attempts are made to drown the speakers out with slow clapping. Iskenderov also points out that this is not a rally for presenting manifestos but a meeting between editors and readers and says that if the authors of the demand wish to present their material to the editorial board the magazine will consider it for publication.

Another man from the audience gets hold of the roving microphone and says: "Don't you feel, esteemed editors of this magazine, that just like several years ago, your publication carries materials which are in complete dissonance with the things that are presently being revealed. Today it is clear to everyone in this room and to every citizen of the Soviet Union that something monstrous has happened to Russia, while the historians, such as yourselves and us, too, by the way, are engaging in publishing all sorts of Trotskys and memoirs." An old man adds: "There's no need to raise Trotsky from the grave. Why do you want to raise all the dead from their graves, including Khrushchev? Why do you want to do that? Khrushchev did a lot of harm to agriculture. Now all our villages are in ruin thanks to Nikita Khrushchev and Brezhnev. Didn't you know?" The man who first objected to publication of Trotsky resumes: "You can carry on producing falsifications on the pages of your magazine. No one is going to read your Trotsky."

Further actuality of an erupting shouting match is overlayed by Ulyanova: "That was the unexpected turn which this apparently routine meeting took. A small group of people interpreting democracy as a free-for-all strove not so much to elucidate questions that interested them but to break down the dialogue and impose their position, and only the sensible and calm response from the members of the magazine's editorial board enabled the meeting to go on."

Inviting Khrushchev's son to speak, Iskenderov adds: "I have a feeling that there is a group of people here who have set themselves a completely different objective. They have come not to meet with the magazine but to present their platform. Well, I can tell you that questions be submitted in writing.

Khrushchev begins: "I am very grateful to the editorial board which has set about publishing this great work of my father's, his memoirs, which he wrote when he was already retired, so to speak. It is a big work, it contains several thousand pages. I cannot even say precisely how many because it was dictated onto cassette tapes." He goes on to describe the difficulties of sorting the material out but notes that only one chronological error was discovered in the first installment. He explains that "these memoirs cover a long period, starting about 1930 until 1964. Up to 1954 they are chronological and after that they go by various topics. I have been working on these documents for 20 years now." Khrushchev goes on to explain the difficulty of editing and transcribing tape-recorded material. "I raised the issue of publishing this material 3 years ago. As we all know, it has been published in the West... There were two books: 'Khrushchev Remembers' and 'Khrushchev Remembers: The Last Testament'. That was an abridged edition. Approximately one-quarter or one-third of all that had been dictated. It was translated into 16 languages, including Russian. There is a Progress translation from the English edition. It is a numbered edition of several hundred copies. As you know, OGONEK has been publishing excerpts, ZNAMYA magazine has been publishing bits and pieces, and I am very grateful that the VOPROSY ISTORII magazine has undertaken the very difficult task of publishing the whole thing in a definitive form.

"And when this work began, it suddenly came to me that my father, Khrushchev, is somehow taking part in our struggle today. I even have the impression that when someone wants to lash out at Mikhail Sergeyevich, but lacks the nerve to do so, he can instead lack out at Nikita Sergeyevich.

"The memoirs are very candid, by the way. They include Nikita Sergeyevich's attempts to interpret the repressions of the 1930's, his description of his role and things that happened in the later years, including the events in Novocherkassk—and these happened not only in Novocherkassk but also in Karaganda. So there are all kinds of things there. And today we are still working on these tapes."

Overcoming continuous noise from the audience, Khrushchev gets down to questions that were submitted

in writing. He explains, in response to one concerning an account of Khrushchev's "road towards his report on the cult of personality at the 20th CPSU Congress," that he would hardly be the right person to write such an account "but in the material that has been deciphered and which is at the magazine there is a detailed account of the period between Stalin's death and the 20th congress. I will only cite two of what I think are cornerstone features along this road. The rest you can read in the magazine. I hope it will all be published."

"The first clash that there was," Khrushchev goes on, "was with Beriya in 1953, when Beriya raised before the Central Committee Presidium the issue that the time was coming up when the people who had spent 10 years in 1943, 1944, and 1945 were to be released from the camps and Beriya proposed that a decision be made and the terms for all of them be automatically extended by a further 10 years. There was a very stormy debate. In the end, Beriya suffered defeat, and that decision was not made.

"Another decision, and this was partly described in the ARGUMENTY I FAKTY weekly, was linked with the 20th congress. I believe that the 20th congress decided even more serious issues than those that we think it did today. Our history assesses it by saying that it was only the exposure of the cult of personality and Stalin's crimes. The question of which way our country should go was decided at that time. This is described in the memoirs. It says there that Khrushchev thought that if today we do not expose Stalin's crimes and, as he says there, every one of us that was by his side bears his share of responsibility for these, and, he says, that perhaps he bears less—according to himself—responsibility than others but if he were called to account, he would be ready to answer for it. He was fully aware of what that would have meant. But he believed that if we don't say this today, tomorrow the leadership will only follow the road followed by Stalin and continue committing crimes. Consequently, he believed that at the time they took the first step from a lawless state toward a law-governed one," he concludes to continuing shouts from the audience.

Another man on the platform, Nikolay Nikolayevich Bolkhovityanov, corresponding member of the Academy of Sciences, picks up: "I would like to note that we have heard some very sharp criticism here of Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchev. But if there had not been a Nikita Sergeyevich, today we would not be sitting in this room and freely debating these issues, all his mistakes notwithstanding." This is met with applause, although there is still some shouting from members of the audience.

Invited by Iskenderov to tackle some of his written questions, Bolkhovityanov goes on to say that he has questions about the "situation with the libraries and the archives." "There are questions in particular," he says, "about when the archives are finally going to be opened, when special stocks are going to be abolished. I will say that obviously these issues worry all professional historians, because perhaps the thing which we now lack most is access to information. This is extremely important not merely to historians but, as I see it, to the whole Soviet society. I will say that as far as libraries and archives go, we have been singularly unlucky. You know that the national library is an accumulation of the country's entirety of knowledge. Without it it is not just the historians who cannot do their work but also the doctors, the mathematicians, the physicists, and so on. It is our national property and the current situation obviously makes everyone very unhappy. And altogether we almost completely lack an information service on the materials that there are in the archives which have now become accessible. I would say that the problem of access continues to remain a very important one. We need a law on freedom of information, on free access to archives.

"There is also a question about when the party archives are going to be opened and what my view is on this. I would say that, of course, all archives should be open. In order to get a balanced and objective overall picture we should undoubtedly take into consideration the materials of all the sides, whatever our attitude to these figures may be...You can have a very negative attitude to, say, Trotsky, but this is part of our history. We have to know these materials in order to make the right assessments."

A young man in the audience interrupts by shouting: "(?Why don't you talk) about the archives that right now are being incinerated, destroyed? When they open them there will be nothing left there! That's what you should be talking about!"

"I would like to add to Nikolay Nikolayevich's answer to the question about the archives," says Professor V.P. Danilov, Doctor of Historical Sciences, from the platform. "The work on opening the closed archives is proceeding very slowly and of course we have to strive for this work to be speeded up. But at the same time you have to realize that archives are not an antiquarian bookshop where you can come in and immediately find what you need on the right shelf. Over here are Stalin's crimes, here's Trotsky, the 1932-33 hunger is over here, this is where the victims of the repressions are, and so on. Archives are the sort of material which require serious, long and thorough research work. This takes years. You have to be aware of that. And consequently, in demanding that archives be opened you must not expect that if today they open an archive, tomorrow you are going to get the complete answer to some question which worries the public printed in your paper or your magazine."

Invited to speak next, Viktor Aleksandrovich Kumanev, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, says: "I have an unsigned letter here. Although we have not carried any material on this in VOPROSY ISTORII, I think it has been widely covered in our popular press. 'Could you tell us please what were the causes of the Leningrad Case.' You understand, of

course, that I cannot answer this but I will try to. 'In reading articles describing it I formed the impression that it was rather a question of the Zhdanov case. After all, it was precisely Zhdanov who promoted all the figures concerned in the Leningrad Case, including Kosygin who, although he didn't suffer, was demoted in 1952. And why was the Leningrad Case trial secret?' You see how many questions about Stalin we get here. 'After all, Voznesenskiy and others simply disappeared from the public eye. Their works were withdrawn from libraries.'

"So, what were the causes of the Leningrad Case. The reason for it was to throw the people down on their knees again, to humiliate them one more time, to make the people wade through blood. But I would say that the cause was fairly simple. There was an exhibition, entitled 'Leningrad Under Blockade' and there was no portrait of Stalin in front of the exhibition. Someone reported it and the well-known butchers that surrounded Stalin, above all Malenkov, Beriya, Kaganovich, and undoubtedly Zhdanov had their hand in it—Abakumov too—so they produced this so-called Leningrad Case."

The young man who was earlier worried about the destruction of archives yells from the stalls: "Kaganovich is still alive today and he gets a personal all-union merit pension!"

"I would say," resumes Kumanev, "I can add to what you have just said, although you interrupted me, that neither has Kaganovich so far been stripped of the Gold Star of a Hero of Socialist Labor, and that is a disgrace.

"Right, now, comrades, let's talk about why this trial was secret rather than open. How many open trials have we had, apart, of course, from the fabricated trials, the so-called show trials, starting with the Shakhty Case, the Industry Party, the so-called Union Bureau of the Menshevik Central Committee, and those horrific trials of the 1930's? I met (Vasiliy Vasilyevich Koltsov), Voznesenskiy's aide, in the early seventies. He told me terrifying things about Nikolay Alekseyevich Voznesenskiy's final days. As you probably know, Stalin had even been preparing Voznesenskiy for his successor. And Beriya for a very long time went on trying to get him into his torture chambers. Stalin kept brushing these efforts aside but finally he granted the wish. Voznesenskiy himself felt that trouble was approaching. He felt it even through some resolutions. I was told by Koltsov, which Poskrebyshev, who was neither a member of the Politburo, nor a secretary of the Central Committee—he was Stalin's aide—could write to him, like "Hey you Veznesenskiy, you produce the conclusions in 90 minutes' time.' And when Nikolay Alekseyevich was being arrested—he had prepared a major work about the political economy of the future—those who were arresting him threw this manuscript up in the air. Voznesenskiy was trying to collect the pieces of his work and was subjected to humiliations.

"Comrade Kuznetsov, secretary of the Central Committee, who, as we know, had started to look after the state security bodies, came to a very distressing end. Koltsov shared the cell with him. Kuznetsov kept walking around the cell and went on repeating just one thing...'The most important thing is to survive, to survive this hell. There's something incomprehensible happening here.' And so on, things of that kind.

"I am telling you, comrades, about these horrific things not just to remind you once again about the kind of crimes committed by this tyrant who has no equal in history. Everyone choses his followers. Yagoda, Yezhov, Beriya, Ulrikh, Vyshinskiy—he needed them all. Then, once they had served their purpose, new reinforcements of inquisitors would arrive."

Iskenderov says: "We used to have this considered line, considered policy under which significant periods, even eras, in the life of our country and our peoples were simply falsified. Or they were out of bounds to study, out of bounds to teaching, out of bounds to our consideration. That, comrades, was reality. People at these meetings often ask us what is our historical destiny. And we have to answer where are we from, who we are and what awaits us. I have a question here which says that you, the historians, should also deal with forecasts and tell us what's going to happen to us in 2-3 years' time. Well, I would like everything to be fine for us in 2 or 3 years' time and I would like our society at least to realize who we are, where we live and why our life is so poor, what our historical destiny is and where the causes of what has happened lie. All these things you've been saying over there—I would gladly, along with you, put Stalin on a pedestal right this moment if that would make things easier for us. But that is not going to make things easier for us. It will make things worse for us a hundredfold, if not a thousandfold. You keep trying to drag us back, while we are trying to look ahead, because what happened to us, it is clear to everyone, bad, it was bad because there was Trotsky, it was bad because there was Stalin. There's no doubt about that. But now we have to speak about why that happened, what is our historical destiny, where we are and who we are, that is what we historians have to deal with."

In his turn A.P. Novoseltsev, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, says: "I have a question more or less along these lines... who is going to elaborate a new conception of history and when will there finally be a fundamental work on our country's modern history, and which historians are dealing with this?

"This is an extremely important issue. I, as director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of History, am directly concerned with this and I can tell you the following. We planned initially to write a one-volume work on the USSR, the Soviet period. We planned it about a year ago and started working on it. We involved our major specialists in it, Viktor Petrovich Danilov, who is here with us, is involved with it, (Vladimir Petrovich Dmitrenko) and a whole number of our other

most important specialists are involved, and we started to prepare this work. And, having worked on it for several months, we concluded that right now we would not be able to produce it in one volume. We had to split it in practice into two volumes, or two half-volumes—one up to the end of the Great Patriotic War and the second one on the subsequent period. We will complete the first half volume this year. It has practically been written now. I do not know when we will complete the second half-volume... The thing is that as far as the period 1917-45 is concerned, our comrades have now entered the archives. They are working on all kinds of archive materials, working on these documents and bringing them into academic circulation. And for that period we can indeed—not without errors naturally, no one is immune from mistakes—cast light on all the key problems. But for the period after 1945 so far we have not even been entering the archives. These archives have not been studied, so what can we write without a good documentary base." He goes on to answer a question about the possibility of a popular history, rather than a learned work, being written, by saying that there are very few writers who could tackle such a task.

"And another question that I have here," proceeds Novoseltsev, "concerns a specific topic: 'During the period of Khrushchev's voluntarism and then during Brezhnev's period of stagnation opportunists in historical science launched on a wide front a thesis about the universal voluntary entry into Russia of the peripheral national territories in the 17th and other centuries. Russia was a prison of peoples, and first and foremost, of the Russian people. What does the editorial board propose to do eliminate these falsities in science?

"Well, if you read our magazine, you would have seen in issues No 5 and 6, I think, materials from a debate on the nationalities question which our magazine held with the participation of many scientists from the union and autonomous republics. You'll find there a full transcript of the contributions and I think that these materials in our magazine provide a full answer about the magazine's general position on this issue.

"As far as the joining of Russia by other peoples is concerned I would say the following—I also spoke at the debate—that obviously it was a very complex process, different peoples joined Russia in different ways. In some cases there was straightforward conquest, subjugation with all the horrors which always and everywhere accompany such events. In other cases it took place peacefully. And I think in the immediate future we, along with republican historians, are going to sort these matters out."

A young man from the audience asks: "...What is being done to fill in the so-called white patches in the history of the union republics, and specifically I have a question about the treaty between Soviet Russia and Georgia."

The question is fielded by Novoseltsev: "As far as the question of the establishment of Soviet power in Georgia is concerned and the initial establishment of a national government there, at the head of which were Georgian Mensheviks, the issue is of course not as simple as we used to present it. As far as I know the events there, in Georgia, at the time were indeed complicated. There were protests equally against the Menshevik government, but the Menshevik government also had its supporters. And there was a treaty between the Georgian Republic and the Russian Republic. I think that now we again have to look closely at these documents and, having studied them, pronounce the final verdict, the final solution on this question."

Another member of the panel, O.A. Rzheshevskiy, Doctor of Historical Sciences, takes the floor next. In response to a question on whether the Peace of Brest was a mistake, he explains that the issue has been thoroughly researched and that such events are "historically conditioned by specific situations which prevail at the time."

"My next question," he goes on, "is why doesn't the magazine publish materials about the allies' assistance during the war years, the convoys with lend-lease supplies and so on.

"I would say that in about 6 months' time....or perhaps a little later the readers will find a new line in the magazine, namely articles by U.S. and British authors, including those on the history and problems of the World War II and the Great Patriotic War. And at our offices we already have two articles by U.S. professors on the second front and on lend-lease, so we are without doubt going to continue this line.

"I would also note that now there is a clearly visible tendency in scientific research to combine efforts on the problem of the anti-Nazi coalition between U.S., British, and Soviet historians. The Institute of General History has now began working on a joint work on a history of the anti-Nazi coalition with U.S. and British historians. And the solution that has been adopted is that U.S. historians are writing about the United States in the anti-Nazi coalition, Soviet historians about the Soviet Union, and British historians about Britain, so that various positions are reflected. I think that's a sufficiently modern approach."

A man asks from the stalls why nothing has been written about the role of Mekhlis in the purges of the late thirites. Iskenderov replies that they cannot do everything at once. Pressed by the same man about an article on Bela Kun's activities in the Crimea in the twenties and complete nonmention of his responsibility for executions of Red Army men, Iskenderov explains that the article was written by a Hungarian author and it was not up to the editors to extend the piece by what was lacking. But that aspect would be covered in another material in some future edition.

Kumanev takes the floor again: "And the last question, about setting up a history society. 'In Russia,' it says here, 'last century there were a great many of them. When is a history society going to be set up in our

country?" As we know, we used to have a history society. Stalin concluded that history society was uncontrollable. At the time there was great criticism of the Pokrovskiy School, there was also the closure of THE MARXIST HISTORIAN magazine, and so on, and the society was closed down, it was dissolved. In 1961 a large group of prominent figures in our party wrote a letter to the Central Committee with a request to reinstate the society. Unfortunately, during the period of stagnation this question was removed from the agenda. Suslov just wrote a brief resolution to Topchev and that was that.

"Now this issue is not merely being debated. We think that the society is going to be set up and probably in the immediate future. In the union republics, in particular in the Ukraine, there will be a society of local historians created literally within months, a history society is being created in Georgia. It is a very salutary process."

"Any science," says Iskenderov, "including historical sciences, should proceed from the actual needs of society and the situation that prevails in society. And to our common, I think, regret I would say that the level of historical education, the level of historical knowledge, if you like, of historical self-awareness is very low in our society. We—I am saying this on the basis of data available to us—we were prisoners of a great many myths, stereotypes, cliches and stock phrases, and dogmas that were imposed from above. We have no time to speak about this in detail right now. But we should do everything possible with the assistance of historical sciences and with everyone's assistance to raise the level of the people's historical awareness or self-awareness. This may sound like lofty words, but it is the absolute truth. We have to get involved in historical education, we have to teach the people, that is what they want right now. Just look at what great interest in history there is now. We see it from the mail we get, from the many people who participate in our magazine. We are duty bound to do this. Today this is a demand from our society, we cannot get away from it. If we wait until the Institute of the History of the USSR, other institutes,...produce their fundamental scientific research, it will take years. And we have no time to wait. We have to tell the historical truth today, or at least strive toward it. This movement towards historical truth is vital." He closes the meeting, saying they are out of time and apologizing to those whose questions they did not manage to answer.

Ulyanova concludes: "And this was the end of this meeting, one of the many meetings which are today taking place in our society. Its participants did not leave for a long time, wanting to get immediate answers to questions which interested them, because today history has not merely become a sore point of our society— it has become one of the ways of seeking the truth, one of the not-so-easy processes of raising our self-awareness. Arguments, disputes, different views at such meetings are a sign of democratic process in the making. And this making is not possible without dialogue—calm, considered, and argumented dialogue. That is in the interests of the whole society and each and every one of us.

"And this is where we say good-bye," says Ulyanova, as the picture shows VOPROSY ISTORII subscription details.

Youth Paper To Be Published in Irkutsk

LD0110233489 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2230 GMT 1 Oct 89

[Summary] The first issue of the STUDIYA, a new youth publication, is to be distributed in Irkutsk Oblast next week. The issue will publish topical reports on students' life and the activity of informal associations, inluding that of the Irkutsk section of anarchists-syndicalists.

New 'Press Bulletin' Published in Dushanbe

LD1310153889 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 13 Oct 89

[Text] The first issue of the press bulletin in DUSHANBE-30 has been published. It is published by the party's city committee and the editorial office of the city's newspaper VECHERNYY DUSHANBE. It will acquaint the residents of Dushanbe with all the changes which are happening in the political, economic, and cultural life of the republic's capital and the progress being made in the fight against crime. The press bulletin describes the main trends in the activity of the party committees. It is intended that reports should be published on the work of USSR people's deputies in carrying out the mandates of the electorate, and on the course of preparations for elections to local soviets.

Plane Using 'Alternative Fuel' To Fly to France

LD1510135889 Moscow World Service in English 1200 GMT 15 Oct 89

[Text] A unique Soviet airliner, Tupolev-155, using gas for fuel, will make a flight to France in the near future. It will be displayed in Nice during an international symposium on applications of liquefied natural gas. To use that fuel for an airliner the designers had to solve many problems and radically change the engine and fuelling system. Western experts find that the Soviet Union is 5 years ahead of other countries in using alternative fuels. Last year a plane fuelled with liquid hydrogen was tested in this country.

Cheap Night Electricity for Heating Rural Homes

PM0310145589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 1

[Article by L. Kaybysheva and A. Blokhin: "Night Rate"]

[Text] By decision of the USSR State Committee for Prices separate (day and night) rates for electricity have been introduced. At the "night rate," 1 kw-hour is reduced by 75 percent.

True, an innovation of this kind has its own "narrow specialist" application: Only country dwellers are

allowed to use cheap electricity and then only for the heating of homes. People in the Ukraine were first to use the preferential rate on quite a wide scale.

"The introduction of electric heating in the countryside," V. Silyarov, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic minister of power and electrification, said, "makes it possible to provide comfortable living conditions equal to those of city dwellers. This is an important condition which is helping to bring people back to the land. The republic's power workers engaged in electric heating supply have expanded the network which makes it possible to use 1.5 million kw for this specific purpose at night time."

...Czechoslovak stoves have been installed in homes on a street in the village of Stava on a farm sponsored by power workers in Kiev Oblast's Kagarlykskiy Rayon. For the heating of public buildings the cumbersome coal-fired boiler which pumped out smoke for many years has been replaced by two environmentally clean and fully automated water storage containers with a capacity of 100 cubic meters each. Water is pumped into them from four boilers which, like a kettle, heat the water using 400 kw elements. How much will this heat cost the customer? That question is answered by deputy minister I. Magda, an electric heating fan.

"The past winter showed," he said, "that the cost of this heating is comparable with coal-fired heating. At the same time concerns over the supply of fuel are eliminated. It is clean. It is convenient. One village in each oblast in the Ukraine could be switched to electric heating this year. The main difficulty is the shortage of heating units."

Why has only electric heating been chosen to even out the fluctuation in power demand at night [nochnoy proval] and why only in rural localities? Perhaps industrial enterprises, in particular those working in conditions of real economic accountability, would also be able to organize energy-intensive production activites at night? And finally, what proportion of the burden could be borne by urban nightowls who keep vigil usually long after midnight? The editorial office asked N. Boyko, deputy chief of the USSR Ministry of Power and Electrification Main Economic Administration, to answer these questions.

"On the strategy of power production," Nikolay Dmitriyevich explained, "you have to begin with the point that in our country the cost price of electricity has traditionally been extraordinarily low. With rare exceptions it doesn't even have seasonal fluctuations although in some capitalist countries there are dozens of different rates. Electricity comprises just 2-3 percent of the net cost of industrial output in our country. In that case will enterprises bother themselves with a night shift if its cost is higher than the benefits of using the preferential rate for electricity? The extremely low cost of 1 kw-hour here does not encourage thrift."

Of course, it is possible to make good use of the Ukraine's experience in the organization of electric heating in villages on a wider scale and, incidentally, this is a far more acceptable way of regulating the load. Unfortunately, no one wants to think about organizing the production of the necessary equipment.

However, we are all well aware that the source of the river of electricity is not inexhaustible. Flexible tariffs are a real way of maintaining its full flow.

Economic

Ryzhkov Notes 'Complex' Economic Situation

LD1510224589 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1600 GMT 15 Oct 89

[Interview with Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and USSR Council of Ministers chairman, by Lev Voznesenskiy; conducted in Ryzhkov's office; date not given; from the "Political Rostrum" program—recorded]

[Text] [Voznesenskiy] We are, comrades, in the office of Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. The Council of Ministers and other state organizations, including central television, are receiving many letters from working people of our country which, with agitation and sometimes even sharply, examine the most topical questions affecting everyone, the progress of perestroyka in our society. But of course, most of the questions—and they are the sharpest of all—are about our economic situation. How do you evaluate it, Nikolay Ivanovich?

[Ryzhkov] The economic situation of the country remains very complex, difficult, and, I would say, contradictory. This is felt every day by Soviet people. Much is being said about it at the sessions of the Supreme Soviet, on the pages of our press, and on television screens; and of course the development of the economy is the government's main concern.

What is taking place in this sphere in the social life of our country? Two years ago, we began a practical implementation of the economic reform which was drafted and approved in 1987. We estimate that those bases laid in the new reform create a good basis for the further development of the economy and, most importantly, a very important turn in the entire economy, the entire national economy toward the solution of social problems. At present there is such a stage at which we are starting to implement it and there are certain positive developments. But a man's frame of mind is such that he would like all this to take place very quickly and for results to come much faster than they have. But it is necessary to be realistic.

First, our economy is very large and correspondingly has a high rate of inertia. Tens of thousands of enterprises are working as part of the national economy which

earlier worked in certain conditions of mutual relations. Today they have to restructure themselves and to work on completely new principles. For people to learn, for this process to be harmonized, time is of course required.

Second, there is the social turn, a turn of the economy toward social problems. We started this work 4 years ago. Of course, there is a very big, sudden break here, a structural break. For example, for the defense complex of the country to produce equipment for light industry or for the processing industry of the agro-industrial complex or producing consumer goods, vast financial and material resources are needed and cadres have to be retrained. All this, too, needs time, of course. And a factor of not small importance, I would say, is the actual stage through which we are going at present. The old administrative measures, methods of management of the national economy, are disappearing gradually; this is a natural process and new economic methods, well arranged, are becoming established with difficulty. Thus at this stage we are using both old methods and new ones.

Of course, we do not get by without errors, although I must say that a great many enterprises, by making good use of those rights accorded to them by our laws and resolutions, achieve good results in both their production and their social life. I think that they are really achieving that which they previously could not even dream about.

At the same time, we sense and know that in the course of implementing economic reform, there are also a great deal of negative phenomena. Well, for instance, many enterprises and organizations, once they have acquired a greater freedom of action, do not use it to increase production, to improve the material position of their workers accordingly, or to resolve social issues and production issues; they frequently act in such a way so that they live at the expense either of other enterprises or of society as a whole. As a result, production discipline and labor discipline decline, there are poor contracts or large upsets in deliveries of products to other enterprises, and ultimately those enterprises whose labor collectives are working well also suffer.

The so-called situation concerning economic egoism has recently begun to become acute. It consists in the fact that the resources which an enterprise possesses are directed only, say, toward wages. At the same time, neither the social issues for the collective nor the production issues are resolved. Of course, this, too, is an inadmissible phenomenon. It is living only for today. And life has shown that those collectives which live for the profits of the moment are punished for this sooner or later. All in all, this is a path which does not lead to any major changes in their life.

That is as far as the negative phenomena which exist in our life are concerned. All in all, I can say that economic reform has, as I have already said, a good basis, and I think that the laws which are now being examined in the USSR Supreme Soviet will create a better, more solid basis for our further forward progress in the area of economic development.

[Voznesenskiy] There is a considerable amount of discussion in the press and television, in the labor collectives, and indeed simply in everyday life, about the correlation between money and the mass of goods in our consumer market. In this context, certain comrades regard very critically the resolution on the observance of a strict dependence between production growth and labor remuneration which was recently adopted in the USSR Supreme Soviet.

[Ryzhkov] To get an idea of all the consequences of this discrepancy between the growth in earnings and production of goods and output including consumer goods, I should like to cite some figures by way of illustration.

In the first three years of the current 5-Year Plan, the output of goods other than food increased by 32 billion rubles, or by 18 percent. This means that the amount of goods we produced already equals the increase in production in the last 5-Year Plan period. And in the first 9 months of this year the growth in goods already amounted to 11 billion rubles. That is also a substantial growth. At the same time, we realize that today, even with this growth, we do not have enough goods for the population. And we feel this every day. What is happening, after all? We have grown in production, we have growth in goods, but we have not got all this in the shops. The fact is, really, incomes are growing much faster than the goods. That is the main trouble, and it engenders very many negative phenomena in our lives.

Take, for example, the third quarter of this year. This is a specific example. In the third quarter the growth in the population's incomes amounted to 13 percent, but the growth in production was only 1 percent. Comment is superfluous, as they say. It is quite obvious that the balance of the national economy is being very strongly upset. Therefore the Supreme Soviet took the appropriate decision which is directed at regulating to some degree these trends which have started strongly manifesting themselves in the national economy. If this is not halted, it will literally have a landslide effect, which is difficult to cope with. And, in the final count, it will be the lowest-paid people who will suffer. They will bear the brunt.

Therefore, we must not tolerate this situation. I think that a very hard line should be conducted on this. Our position is this: We are not in favor of freezing pay. We are not in favor of freezing incomes. But it is necessary that money should always be backed with output. And I hope that with this I have tried to reply to the numerous letters which are being received by the Council of Ministers on the said question.

[Voznesenskiy] Evidently the shortage of both resources and many consumer goods, the disruptions in supplies to the population, have given some people the impression

that our economy finds itself altogether at an impasse. What do you think of such statements?

[Ryzhkov] At the beginning of our conversation I said that the economy is in a complex situation and I could repeat the same thing, but nevertheless I regard more optimistically the processes which are taking place in the economy. I am firmly convinced that the ailment which has struck the economy can be coped with. We have every foundation for getting ourselves out of the situation in which we find ourselves. If some decisions are not made today this will really place the whole economy and consequently the whole life of Soviet people in a very difficult situation. Therefore, this question has to be dealt with. We are systematically investigating and making decisions to improve the situation.

There are also positive factors in the life of our country, in the development of our economy. I have already said that several years ago there began a very serious turning point in the whole of the economy, the whole of the national economy, in the direction of resolving social problems. I would like to cite a few figures to show these changes which are taking place in the economy. If we are to speak of this in more specific terms, and especially that which concerns every individual, I would single out, primarily, housing and social construction. Thus, if in the last 5-Year Plan period the average annual quantity of housing commissioned was 110 million square metres, then in the current 5-Year Plan period we commission 129 million per annum, and it is now estimated that in the course of this 5-Year Plan period we will increase housing construction by 21 percent, as compared with the preceding 5-Year Plan period.

I would like to remind you that in the 9th, 10th and 11th 5-Year Plan periods we did not have any growth in housing, that is, for three 5-Year Plan periods it was at the same level. Furthermore, the average annual commissioning of preschool establishments has gone up by 23 percent, hospitals by 20 percent, polyclinics by 41 percent. Or in garden allotments: In just under 4 years working people have received 6.5 million of them; that is more than over all the other years of Soviet power. Another matter is, of course, the development of our economy in the area of consumer goods production. I have already spoken about this, and at the present time, we are really involving in the resolution of this problem all national economic complexes and all union republics. We feel that we are beginning to get a return and we hope that in the very near future the situation here will, of course, be seriously rectified.

Of course, I do not want my words to be taken as some sort of attempt to calm people down; I understand very well what is going on in the country, what kind of situation has come about. Nevertheless, we now have to put into effect the sort of measures to rectify this kind of thing.

[Voznesenskiy] It is natural, Nikolay Ivanovich, that the most acute of all the acute questions, in what people say, in letters, and in the media, is connected with food supplies. This is of concern, perhaps, to people practically throughout the entire country, the more so as ever where provisions are distinguished, in quantitative terms, on the plus side compared with, say, some neighboring oblasts and rayons, there still remains a problem with the quality of food products. I would like to know your view on this matter.

[Ryzhkov] The food supply problem concerns and alarms us. We understand that it is precisely the provision of food that comes to the fore today in resolving everyday needs of the population. You know that the relevant decisions have been taken which will make it possible for us to improve the situation here, and at the same time I think that we all have to become involved in this matter, both at the center and in the localities. But what are the ways of resolving the food supply problem? There is the traditional way: Increasing production of agricultural output; we have been constantly taking this path. But there are, clearly, certain definite limits, and the main thing is that this path requires very great expenditure in the national economy. There is a second path which we have taken: That is doing things in such a way that what is grown is processed, is stored properly, is transported properly, and by doing so we can ensure the provision of food to the people much more cheaply, with less expenditure.

In order for you to get an idea of this I would like to quote some figures. Next year we are planning that R156 billion worth of food products will be produced in the national economy throughout the whole country. The specialists say that to solve the current food shortage we need R190 billion worth. That is to say, there is a 20 percent shortage of food in the country. At the same time if one analyzes all our losses in agricultural produce, then that amounts to 30 percent. A more intensive processing of agricultural produce will also ensure a higher quality of food poroducts. The main thing, therefore, is that all efforts today should be concentrated on processing the harvest that has been grown and thereby resolve all of our problems.

I inderstand that this is a complex path. It requires the solution of many questions, both organizational and technical ones. We are building processing enterprises very slowly, very slowly. We recently analyzed the way in which all the decisions made earlier on the construction of processing enterprises are being fulfilled, and it turned out that with few exce,tions many areas of processing have virtually not been fulfilled. And of course this does not give us any foundations for moving forward more quickly where food poroduction is concerned.

There is a shortage of equipment. But we have brought in the country's defense complex for this purpose and as is known the defense complex has to make equipment for the agroindustrial complex. Already 176 enterprises in the defense complex are working on the production of equipment for processing. Next year 233 enterprises will be so working.

To resolve all scientific research and planning problems 135 scientific research institutes and design bureaus have been brought in. Of course there will be a return on this, and we consider that generally we can solve in the main the problem of the production of equipment for the processing industry of the agroindustrial complex during 1990-1991. The second problem—I would say that it is perhaps to some extent even a moral and political one, as well—is the participation of everyone in the solution of the food problem, both at the center and in the localities. It is no secret that more than 30 oblasts in our country are not badly supplied with food. I am not saying that everything is wonderful there, but at least they satisfy the population's requirements for food products there, and people value this. Why are there oblasts which are under the same kind of conditions but which are unable to solve the problems that their neighbors are solving? This issue, therefore, depends in many respects upon the way in which the local bodies of government, the party organizations, and other administrative organizations resolve these problems.

It is necessary, necessary for specific measures to be worked out and implemented in every region. Only then can we cope with this very complex, I would say, task. It will be the happiest day of my life when we stop buying food from abroad. This is my dream.

[Voznesenskiy] Nikolay Ivanovich, all the same, letters often ask when a real change, on the whole, for the better can be expected in our economic situation and, consequently, when there will be real improvement in people's well-being.

[Ryzhkov] We are doing everything possible so that the change begins by 1990. Everyone knows that the government has submitted a draft plan and budget for next year to the USSR Supreme Soviet. At present active preparations are in progress for its examination. All materials are being worked through in commissions and committees. If one is talking in general about our prospects for developing the economy next year—then I have to say that we have laid in truly extraordinary measures which will enable us to make the first step toward improving the health of the economy. And a more substantional and more radical step and stage will be taken in the 13th 5-Year Plan. We are setting the task of solving the main questions of economic improvement of our state in the 13th 5-Year Plan.

Returning again to the year 1990, I have to say that we intend to solve three goals: The first goal is to reduce as much as possible the social tension which exits in society today. For this we have to increase the output of consumer goods and services—in general, to do everything possible in that which is connected with man's life. Second, the second goal is financial improvement. We have to reduce sharply the budget deficit and this, of course, will immediately improve the entire economy. Here we have embarked on quite radical measures. I would like to recall that this year the plan was approved with a deficit of 120 billion rubles and at present the task is for the deficit, to the maximum degree, the permissible deficit, to be reduced as much as possible; and according to our calculations it should not exceed 60 billion rubles. Of course, this very complex task is being set before the entire national economy. But we think that it is a realistic task and it is indeed necessary today to mobilize all our resources, all our possibilities, and all our knowledge to take this large step forward toward financial improvement. Finances are a barometer of the economy, they are an index of its health.

And third, we must not forget about our progressive movement forward. We have to think about the next 5-Year Plan, about future years of development. And the basis for the future is being created today. Thus, when speaking about 1990 we have to also think about the next 5-Year Plan. Those are the three main goals we have set for next year.

If we are to speak of such a topical matter, returning once again to consumer goods, I have to say that unprecedented growth has been proposed for next year: an increase of 20 percent in goods throughout the country as a whole. But if we take a look at certain national economic complexes, then the pace there is much higher. The machine-building complex and the defense complex have growth rates of 35 percent. During the discussion at the commissions and committees of the Supreme Soviet, there are a great many discussions surrounding this at the present time, and at times directly opposing ones, diametrically opposed ones. Some say that these are excessively intensive tasks, that they are unrealistic, that they will just remain on paper; others say that they are quite inadequate for filling the shelves of our shops. I think these assignments have to be adopted, and the whole of the national economy has to be oriented toward them. In the first place, they are essential.

That is the first point, and second, in my view, if we are to really concentrate efforts today, both material and financial, and all enterprises are geared up to fulfilling precisely these assignments, I consider that these are realistic assignments, realistic. For this reason, we must now...[changes thought] the main thing is to concentrate our efforts precisely on this. In accordance with this, the sale of goods to the population—or as we say, goods turnover—is increasing. For example, it is envisaged to increase the growth in goods turnover next year by R40 billion. To get an idea of whether this is great or small, we previously had an annual growth in goods turnover of R15 billion. Those are the sort of figures. Of course, this involves very great complexities, but we have to go through this.

Despite the fact that a complex and grave situation concerning foreign currency is taking shape in our country—well, that is a separate topic for discussion and I do not wish to touch upon it today—we have nevertheless embarked upon allocating part of our foreign currency to the procurement of consumer goods. These decisions have already been adopted. Well, you know with how much difficulty all this has come about, and it is very

intolerable that, now that goods have begun to arrive, our bad management has once again become evident.

Since the beginning of October about 25,000 tonnes of foodstuffs, several thousand tonnes of washing agents, and a very great deal of other goods have not been moved out of our ports. They have not been unloaded, and they have not been moved; they are in the open air, going bad. Our Czechoslovak friends had to use in their internal market 1 million pairs of footwear which they should have supplied to the Soviet Union because we were unable to transport this footwear. Very many such examples may be cited. Some days ago the Council of Ministers Presidium especially examined this issue. We looked into it in detail, and we issued a very serious warning to the managers of railway transport and of the sea fleet: I must state that if the situation is not corrected in the near future we will take the harshest measures against all managers, of any rank, irrespective of either their office or their position in our country, because we can no longer accept this. People simply do not understand now why this is happening, why this is happening with impunity.

In my opinion the responsibility for this situation falls in many respects upon the local administrative organs, upon the party committees for people's control. If we continue to take such an attitude to these issues, then we will never be able properly to satiate the market and we will never be able to regulate the situation which has come about today. Therefore very grave measures must be adopted in the localities.

[Voznesenskiy] Nikolay Ivanovich, life has shown in the recent period, somehow, particularly clearly that instability in the consumer market depends not only on purely economic disorders and some real deficits, but even on factors not directly connected with the economy, such as all kinds of rumors.

[Ryzhkov] I agree with you that, indeed, instability is introduced into the economy, and especially in the consumer market, to a large extent by all kinds of rumors. There have been a very great many of them in the recent period. In many cases, they create a stir first around one product then around another, and very great efforts are needed to normalize this aspect. In some cases we normalize things quickly, and in other cases this takes on a very protracted character. Take, for example, those same laundry detergents. Much has already been said about them, much has been written, and indeed, we have not as yet fully resolved this matter. At the same time, specialists say, specialist sociologists provide us with data that already today inhabitants in the country as a whole have accumulated 6 months worth of synthetic detergents—a 6 month supply.

At the same time I understand that some families appear not even to have one package of detergent. I must inform you that our scientific and medical workers have already warned the government repeatedly that in places where large quantities of synthetic detergents are accumulated allergenic problems, etc., can start. Therefore, it is a very dangerous thing, and I think that people should think about it very seriously to preserve the health of their children and their own health.

[Voznesenskiy] Nikolay Ivanovich, judging by our mail, during this interview viewers are expecting to hear your replies to several other burning questions. Probably the first of them is on reform in price formation.

[Ryzhkov] Yes, we receive a great number of letters about the reform of prices and about prices in general, and of course it is clear I must answer this question. I wish to remind you that the country's leadership has already said repeatedly that in the coming 2 or 3 years we will not carry out any reform of retail prices. There are grounds for this. The consumer market is currently unbalanced, and we therefore believe that it would be premature at this point to engage in retail prices reform and that it would not be beneficial. In consideration of this I must say firmly on behalf of the government that we do not intend, that we are not working out any measures or proposals to alter retail prices next year and so on.

We must work on a price formation system; that is clear. We cannot get by without doing so, but we must do it comprehensively. We must take a very considered approach. I believe that overall we must engage in earnest in a price formation system, in reforming price formation, in the 13th 5-Year Plan. This must be an integral part of the measures for the country's economic recovery. When we are determining in which years we must involve ourselves with wholesale prices, procurement, and retail prices, then we shall submit them for nationwide discussion, to be debated, because such issues of course require very serious discussion, they touch upon the life of every Soviet person. Therefore we shall become involved with these problems in the next 5-Year Plan, as they say, but for the moment no price rises are intended for goods in mass demand, and we are not working on this.

At the start of our conversation I dwelled upon the fact that many enterprises are indeed taking advantage of the fact that they have been granted certain rights to begin raising prices in all kinds of ways to obtain greater profits and more of the corresponding advantages and privileges for their activity. The government is studying this problem very seriously at present and I think that we shall find a solution which stops this impermissible process. We must put a halt to actions by some enterprises which are using their monopolistic position to establish and dictate such prices.

This is our task, and I believe we shall be equal to it. At the same time, some economists and journalists are coming out with a proposal to abolish price controls, state price controls, and launch all of this onto the free market. That means the market would determine what prices exist in our country. I consider that at the present time this is impermissible. If we go down such a path, we

will cause a very serious inflationary spiral. This would be like an avalanche and would be very diffucult to stop, and the main thing, it would affect the broadest strata of the population, first and foremost the poorly off, that is to say retirees or people on fixed incomes or fixed wages. So in my view we must not embark on this now in any event, it is not permissible. Otherwise we shall be attacking the people's standard of living.

[Voznesenskiy] The next question is also connected with the previous one and is also being widely discussed in society. It is the question of monetary reform. You can hear and read all kinds of arguments for and against it. It would be nice to hear the government's position.

[Ryzkhov] Yes, there is a lot being published at the moment on this question, a lot being said on the pages of the press, on the television screen. The government's position is this: It is a very responsible social, economic, and political act. Very responsible. Profound study is essential to approach it, and the main thing is that there should be the economic prerequisites to carry out this reform. For this reason we consider that the economic situation is not ripe today for carrying through this reform, and for this reason at the present time the government is not working on this problem.

So, comrades, I would like to beg you not to believe rumors so much. If we need to tackle questions, let us tackle them in an organized way. We shall give the people information. We know what the difficulties are, and it is better for us to give information ahead of time, but let us not create this sort of stir, this sort of excitement. Anyway, at the present time, in the period of glasnost when all subjects are getting an airing in the mass media, when there is the most detailed discussion in the Supreme Soviet and it is all being broadcast, it is difficult to make any decision without it being known to the people. So we need trust, trust in the government, and trust in the Supreme Soviet, in these matters.

[Voznesenskiy] The last sessions of the Supreme Soviet showed how varied, and even diametrically opposed, I would say, the view of deputies, and of some categories, so to say, of the population, are about cooperatives. What is your personal attitude toward them?

[Ryzhkov] My personal attitude, and indeed the general attitude of the whole government—and we have discussed this question more than once with all the members of the government—is a principled one. It has not changed and is not changing now. I consider that the cooperatives, on their healthy basis, are a kind of activity which ought to be beneficial to our people. But those cooperatives that operate honestly, that produce goods for the population, that carry out other work and services for the population, and...[changes thought] this is a normal process and it supplements and develops our state sector.

But I utterly disagree with the type of cooperatives that are parasites on this. We cannot agree to all kinds of speculative cooperatives existing as parasites now on the healthy bases of the cooperative movement—cooperatives that have absorbed the shadow economy, cooperatives that have been nurtured by the world of crime, cooperatives that take no account of any of our society's morals. I believe that such cooperatives may not continue to exist. They must either restructure their work or they must evidently cease their activity. I have had the opportunity to express myself on this issue, and I now repeat that the further development of the cooperative movement will depend on what position they find in our society. If they operate within the confines of our general morality they will, of course, receive the support of our people. In general, the cause of the cooperative movement rests in the hands of the cooperators themselves.

[Voznesenskiy] And finally, probably the last of the burning questions—for today at least—is the question of strikes. Not long ago, you experienced many difficult days and weeks in this connection. Even for this reason alone, your point of view on this is of particular interest.

[Ryzhkov] It is a complicated issue. It is a new problem for us now. Previously we did not come across such problems in the life of our state. My opinion is that a strike is an extreme measure to defend the interests of the working people, and it has a right to exist, but this right must be used very carefully, in a very considered way, not recklessly, because in the unified national economic complex in which we live, a strike in just one place inflicts punishment not only upon the collective which is striking, it inflicts punishment also upon related enterprises, those people who receive output from them. In the final analysis it inflicts punishment upon the whole of society because the lost output is all paid for from our general income.

I would also like to cite some figures here on what strikes represent for us and their consequences for the national economy. In the first half of this year, the economy was not developing very dynamically, but at least it was relatively stable. The picture in the third quarter is quite different. In the third quarter production rates fell, the development of the economy became sluggish, a great deal of output which is extremely necessary to the national economy was lost, and this is being felt particularly now, on the threshold of winter, a winter which in our view will be a difficult one and which we have to live through. What is happening as a result? The losses of working time in the national economy because of strikes amount to 7 million man days, including more than 2 million in September.

And, as I have already said, it is no coincidence that there has been a slump in economic activity in the 3d quarter and especially in September. In September production rates for industrial output were only 0.3 percent. Well, we have never had such rates. Because of strikes, the participants in the strikes alone failed to produce output to the value of more than R700 million and throughout the national economy this figure comes to around R3 billion. Of course, this cannot fail to leave its

traces on the national economy. We felt it at once and we must take a very cautious approach there to these processes and a very considered approach, and I hope that the law which was published in PRAVDA today will provide an opportunity to regulate all the legal respects in the section on the conducting of strikes and this law must be strictly observed. We will then be protected against all kinds of unpredictable actions in this regard.

Comrades, even a brief review of the state of the economy, of the state of affairs in our country testifies that in order to emerge from this situation, from this complex situation, we need as never before to consolidate all forces and to orient all of society toward creativity. We will then be able to resolve the problems confronting us and which must be tackled very urgently. I have attempted to express all the worries, the considerations, and the problems which concern us. I have attempted to show by which means we intend to do all this. And I hope that our conversations will be regular and that they will enable us to cover particular socioeconomic problems of our country. The government is open to dialogue, and we await with pleasure your proposals on which the government's opinion is necessary or information on what the government is doing to resolve these burning issues.

[Voznesenskiy] Nikolay Ivanovich, as I see it, you are a profoundly optimistic person. Does this optimism of yours, on a human level, coincide with your historical optimism when you reflected on the destiny of restructuring the economy and, consequently, the destiny of perestroyka in society as a whole?

[Ryzhkov] In spite of all the difficulties of the current moment—as they used to say in the olden days, problems crying out for solution—I view the country's development, the long term of the country's development, with great optimism. I am deeply convinced that we are on the right path, and today we need to mobilize ourselves. And I am deeply convinced that all Soviet people, as they have already shown on more than one occasion, when there is some major, state task, they will be able to rally round to resolve it. And in conclusion allow me to wish you all the best, dear comrades.

Abalkin Interviewed on Economic Recovery

LD1410161689 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1842 GMT 12 Oct 89

[Interview with Leonid Ivanovich Abalkin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, by Aleksandr Tikhomirov in the Moscow Kremlin; date not given—recorded]

[Text] [Tikhomirov reads a printed quotation] "What is realy important is the question of the stabilization of the ruble. We are working on this question, our best forces are working on it, and we attach a decisive importance to that task. If we manage to stabilize the ruble for a lengthy period, and subsequently forever, that means we have won"—Vladimir Ilyich Lenin.

There used to be notices posted in studies saying: "When you have finished your business, go away." Where have we hurried to? Here's a figure that I disovered today: The availability of goods for the present-day ruble amounts to just 40 Kopeks in comparison with the early sixties.

So 40 Kopeks of the ruble are goods, and 60 Kopeks are just paper?

[Abalkin] Well, if we [illegible] using that comparison, yes. Or it's simply that the notes have become rather more watery. I have sometimes used the following comparison: We are now trying to extract more and more milk from a cow whose udder is already empty. We are still trying to take from there, and to direct that money toward various objectives without having either any real resources or possibilities. We're diluting the milk with water.

As for the money that cannot be converted into goods today, the estimate—also the assessment of specialists—is that the unsatisfied demand, the deferred demand, of the population amounts to a sum of the order of R100 billion. At the moment, this is money that is not earmarked for long-term saving, when people put money aside for years in order, let's say, to buy a car or an expensive set of furniture, or to build a country cottage. It isn't current demand. It is actually savings, intended for future use. But there is the demand of today. Today, if we were really able to saturate the market with goods and services, the population would already today be ready to present additional demand to the tune of R100 billion. It puts pressure on all the processes and gives rise to everything that we're coming up against—shortages, special rations stores, various coupons, queues, and the speculative buying-up of goods as soon as they appear. That total sum puts pressure on us. It's like weights on our legs that restrain the pace and scale of perestroyka.

[Tikhomirov] I'm convinced, for example, that a considerable section of our society, the people that belong to that section, cannot understand you concretely, through their own pocket, because... take every second person in the street, and maybe even every first person, whichever way it turns out, and he'll say that he hasn't got enough to tide him over from one pay day to the next.

[Abalkin] The reality is that these hundreds of billions of rubles—they now amount already to some R330 billion—are actually lying around in the savings banks. Each person has his personal current account. Admittedly, data about deposits are always secret, and any bank guarantees that information about the depositor will not be divulged, but, nevertheless, it's all personalized. It belongs to actual people.

[Tikhomirov] Yes, but, as was said recently at the meeting in Luzhniki here in Moscow, which took place under the auspices of the trade unions, 80 percent of the population do not have savings books. Is that right, then, that all this vast revenue that hangs over us today and leads to inflation, a serious process, belongs only to a section of the population?

[Abalkin] The information that was given out at the meeting in Luzhniki—and there were press reports about it, I've read those speeches—I must say bluntly that it amounts to a distortion of the truth. It's downright disinformation of public opinion, just like what was said about the number of depositors in the country and about the number of Soviet millionaires—a totally mythical figure was given. It bears no reality. It's not true. I don't know whether the disinformation is deliberate, whether it shows a desire to inflame public passions, or whether it is a matter of incompetence on the part of the speakers, but it does not correspond to reality.

[Tikhomirov] That seemed to me to be extremely dangerous because a process is starting once again in which society calls not for production but for a sharing-out. We'll take something from some people and give it to others. We'll take from those who have a lot and give it to those who have little. One has the impression that there will again come a time when Poverty Committees are set up and the sharing-out starts all over again. all this despite the fact that the whole world has, it seems to me, moved on to a completely new standard of living—a qualitatively new standard—and people simply live properly. They work hard, but their material needs are well catered for, and they can afford things that we are unable to afford after a whole lifetime's work. Meanwhile, we go on sharing out and levelling down, and so on. The feelings of that section of society are now, in general, being played upon. They have the impression that 1917 will start all over again, everything will be taken away once more from the haves and distributed to the have-nots, and everything will have come full circle.

[Abalkin] The economic situation really is very difficult, with the situation so far worsening rather than improving. It helps to intensify such demands for immediate confiscation and dividing up. It inflames the situation. It is some times used—I don't know—in order to gain authority, cheap authority, dishonest authority, and perhaps even some kind of far-reaching political ambitions or intrigues. But only here, especialy since we have, nevertheless, molded an attitude in people, an attitude in behavior, whereby we have demanded and expected everything from the state. We have nurtured not so much even a levelling-down sentiment as a dependent's approach. One can ask for, one can seek, one can demand, via state bodies or via the trade unions, the defense of one's interests, additional benefits, some material or housing benefits. We have become used to sharing out rather than earning. What we must now introduce is, I am sure, in accordance with the internal nature of socialism because it is a system that has a labor basis. In other words, it is based on work and on remuneration according to the work done.

I can imagine a pie that I'm cutting into slices. Well, if I cut one slice larger, I do that by reducing another, so long as the size of the pie remains constant. But the labor principle, the earning principle, is linked with increasing the actual size....

[Tikhomirov] Of the pie.

[Abalkin] Yes, of course. To that extent I am participating in all the social programmes through taxation—ordinary, linear, or progressive. I am participating in the financing of the social programs for assistance to particular strata and categories of the population. But I myself lay claim to a decent part of the social wealth, commensurate with my position, my attitude to work, my intellect, and labor activity.

[Tikhomirov] So we must tell ourselves quite frankly that, in a prosperous state, a prosperous economy, it cannot be that everyone earns the same. One section of the population, at any rate, will live at a richer level, to put it bluntly, while the other will live at a poorer level. Do you think there should be a social principle of distribution?

[Abalkin] There must be the social principle of a guaranteed minimum level of security, as well as all the differentiation in income that it is perfectly legitimate and natural in any, as we say, civilized society, and in a socialist society first and foremost, if it is connected with attitude to work; but a differentiation not at zero and then goes up, but at some socially protected minimum. That is now a reality. Approximately 20 million of our population—sorry, 20 percent. I mean—of our population is in receipt of incomes below the subsistence age.

[Tikhomirov] Let's say frankly that they're below the poverty line.

[Abalkin] Well, one can use various words. One can even regard them as synonyms. The boundary of poverty, the lower boundary of the subsistence wage—they're identical concepts. Yes, they are the poor strata of soviet society. Twenty percent. No one, not a single person, not a single family should live below that. That is a function of social proteciton, a function of the state, if it regards itself as a civilized state, and all the more so if it considers itself a socialist state. But, above that, it's up to you: You can earn as much as a professor or a highly qualified driver, who earns more than a professor. At any rate, your pay should be a measure of your work.

[Tikhomirov] Although it's a pity, perhaps we shall have to say goodbye to the cherished dream, the unrealistic, I would say, idea that existed at the dawn of Soviet rule—that everyone should have an equal share, and everyone should be equally happy.

[Abalkin] Our history has not been at all straightforward, and that dawn was very soon overshadowed by dark clouds and storm clouds, and the levelling-down ideology came into being not right at the dawn, but some time later. It is, in general, an ideology that originated, consolidated itself—and is still alive—at the time of the Civil War, the ideology of War Communism. That's where its roots lie.

[Tikhomirov] I should probably say that that ideology was also founded, among other places, let us say, in the

study in which we now find ourselves—in the Kremlin study. [Video shows view of room] Everything depends not on how a person works, but on what position he obtains and occupies as a result of that work.

[Abalkin] Well, that also arose from the desire to move up the ladder and to hang on to the chair with both hands each time. So, it turns out that he must hang on to the chair with both hands, leaving no hands free to do anything. This gave rise to a particular atmosphere of obsequiousness, deference to rank, accommodation, and the wish to please. It is a whole philosophy. It is a whole layer of sociocultural relations, and it must be reckoned with very seriously, since it will not be overcome by the lightweight, careerist attacks by both scholars and publicists. It is a very serious opponent.

[Tikhomirov] Are you hanging on to that chair?

[Abalkin] [Video shows Abalkin smiling, arms outstretched] Oh, my hands are on the table! My hands are on the table! [Abalkin puts his hands on the table] I have been a more free man, more independent and even, forgive me, more popular. Before I sat down in this chair, I knew what I was taking on, and probably.... [Abalkin does not finish sentence.] You realize that an academician, rector of an institute, and a member of the Academy of Sciences Presidium had sufficient material comforts, social security, and the opportunities for remaining somewhat on the sidelines, displaying his independence and expressing himself freely on any issue without bearing, incidentally, any direct responsibility other than moral responsibility, of course. What has science provided? Why is, in general, a wish to do something, if it is still possible to do anything, for the country, to bring about a turning point in its historical destiny.

[Tikhomirov] Were you prepared for your popularity to begin to decline when you transferred to this position?

[Abalkin] Yes, I knew what I was letting myself in for.

[Tikhomirov] That is what is actually happening. Your name now comes up in meetings, and it is mentioned by deputies from the rostrum of the Supreme Soviet sometimes, in conjunction with the rather unpopular measures, at first glance, that the government is adopting in the battle against inflation. I am referring to the Law on Taxation and the growth of wage funds, about which, incidentally, many people spoke specifically at the meeting in Luzhniki. [Abalkin] I knew what I was letting myself in for, and I took it on quite deliberately. I am now ready to quote the well-known words:

"Sounds of approval are for me
Not timid whispering of praise,
But savage outcries of reproach."

This means that proposed measures have hit the target. They really are having a palpable effect on the process and are not just confined to drafting new pieces of paper. The economy is sick. It is seriously ill; it requires treatment. There is surgical treatment and therapeutic treatment. Nasty medicine must be prescribed for the patient, but it is unpleasant. One would like to do without it, but there is no way of effecting a cure. There is one simple truth, and a very important one, that is sometimes forgotten by those who attend meetings and oppose the draft law: The excessive growth of income, growth that is not backed by any commodity resources—and we have said how great the deficit is today, and it will go on growing unless incomes are restrained—the growth of income is in itself a factor of inflation, the depreciation of the ruble. Moreover, if we now restrain, or try to restrain, the growth—just the continued growth—and not to reduce the income of the particular section of the population that can, nevertheless, earn....

[Tikhomirov, interrupting] It may raise it.

[Abalkin] It may raise it. If these incomes grow unjustifiably, however, they are shared by all.

[Tikhomirov] You mean, inflation is shared by all?

[Abalkin] Inflation is shared by all those who have no direct connection with it. The greater part of our population receive fixed incomes; that is all the pensioners, those who live on a grant, teachers, doctors and the staff of cultural establishments. There are also many workers in the economy who have a rigidly fixed pay scale and who, without receiving anything—no increase, whether it be 3 percent or more,—feel the weight of the general inflation pressing down on them. So, that tax is a rigid tax, an exceptional tax; a tax that has a quite definite time span, 15 months, from October of this year to December of next year.

[Tikhomirov] Until the whole package of laws and taxes begins to operate.

[Abalkin] Until the whole package begins to operate.

[Tikhomirov] I want to quote to you, from memory, a letter—one of the many such letters that we received at Central Television: We're being told all the time that we work badly. Let's carry out an experiment. We'll hand Siberia and the Far East over to the Japanese, and the European part over to the FRG or to some other highly developed European country, and we'll see, in 10 years, with the same people, that there will be a totally new, high-quality standard of living.

[Abalkin] If we go right back to the beginning of our broadcast, I could quote a few more words by the same author, spoken also at the dawn in his classic work The IMMEDIATE TASKS OF THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT: The Russian is a bad worker compared with people in advanced countries. That is true. It's a bitter truth. It's an offensive truth. But if we don't become different, if we don't change our attitude to work, each person in his own place—in the field or the factory, in the scientific laboratory or the government office.... We must become different. Neither the Japanese nor the Germans from the FRG will do that for us.

[Tikhomirov] Maybe those measures that you're adopting today will disintegrate in the face of the quotation from Lenin that you've just mentioned. After all, let's say, we talk nowadays about leasing, leasing, leasing in the countryside, but then we have the conditions for leasing in our country—but not from the Chinese, who will work from dawn till dusk.

[Abalkin] No, it'll never happen. We ourselves have to become different. I'm absolutely certain of that. I agree with what you're saying. There is danger. Inertia, is a danger. The fact that all these measures will come up against the elastic strength of habit and the wish to share out, receive, but not create is a very real danger that exists, and is one of the most serious obstacles to our renewal. For that reason, I have always warned, both previously and now, against euphoria: We'll switch everyone over to leasing, and everything will be available tomorrow; and against our brandishing the slogan "Land to the Peasants!" and so on. Where are the peasants? What peasants?

[Tikhomirov] Will he take that land?

[Abalkin] He'll take it. We are now trying to do what has been condemned and is being condemned today. First, we mount a massive campaign and report on how collectivization is proceeding in our country: How many peasants we've herded in; and now we're starting to arrange similar contests to see who's done most to split up the farm and introduce leasing and we're beginning to compete to see who can report the most leasing. Why haven't you got much? There is no easy way. There is no quick result that can come about like a miracle, like something incredibly fast. Before us lies an extremely hard and difficult path, to be measured in decades.

[Tikhomirov] In that case, how many months have been allotted to us so that we can stabilize, let's say, the process of inflation and find the point of departure from which we shall go on—not downward, but at least evenly, and upward?

[Abalkin] Well, at the moment, the movement really is downward, downhill, and it is necessary, first of all, to stop the process of the downward slide, and then, only after making the line level again, can we start to improve things. I think that we have little time at our disposal. That time, until the end of next year, is the very same 15 months that are often now being misused, in order to stop the slide toward the abyss, make the first perceptible, even if only just perceptible, improvements, and restore confidence to the people. The people's confidence in the ability of the state and the government to do something has been forfeited. A period no longer than that is available, and, if it proves possible to stop it, then it will be possible, I repeat, to start, as you said, really moving horizontally....

[Tikhomirov] And the government knows how to do that?

[Abalkin] I think it does. But that's not enough. It is essential not only to know, but to persuade others, so that the decisions are adopted.

[Tikhomirov] Just as we are now talking face to face, what could you say to the people, the individuals who are now watching their televisions and who are waiting for change? Are you sure that we are treading the right path? Are you sure that we will attain some new level?

[Abalkin] I would just say one thing: Don't get in the way. Fifteen months is not such a long time for trust. We've left decades behind us. Don't get in the way. Then judge.

Abalkin Cites Anti-Inflation Measures in 1990 Plan

LD1410145189 Moscow TASS in English 1434 GMT 14 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 14 TASS—The draft plan for 1990, submitted by the government for consideration by the USSR Supreme Soviet, provides for a 10 per cent rise in monetary incomes, including a 5.7 per cent rise in wages, Deputy Prime Minister Academician Leonid Abalkin told the weekly "ARGUMENTY I FAKTY" (ARGUMENTS AND FACTS). There are no plans to freeze incomes and wages. People who talk about it either do not understand the problem or deliberately misinform public opinion.

As for the concept of progressive taxing of growing incomes, its main aim is to curb inflation, keep the growth of incomes within the planned limits (attempts have so far failed) and thus stabilize the consumer market.

No taxes will be levied on wage increases if they come from higher production of consumer goods and services, construction and repair of housing, social services facilities, the academician pointed out.

The peculiarity of the current taxing system is that it is an extraordinary measure of limited duration—15 months.

Inflation has two components: The growth of prices and the growth of incomes not matched by goods. Today the rates of inflation are largely affected by the growth of incomes unmatched by goods. The level of prices in this case is a derivative and reflects market imbalances which will force prices up in hidden and open forms. This happens all over the world. The more money in circulation, the higher the prices. Not vice versa.

"Therefore we are trying to address the cause rather than the consequence," Abalkin said.

"We tried in deed rather than in word to engage economic levers, like taxes, in order to make enterprises satisfy people's needs: Increase the production of food, clothes, footwear, furniture, housing, cinemas, hospitals,

and schools. Producers of these goods and services are exempt from paying taxes on the increment of the wage fund."

Another fact which many opponents do not take into account is that the law affects only a small portion of the population. A great number of people have fixed incomes, which do not rise. They include pensioners, scholarship holders, medical staff, teachers, office employees and workers, who are paid by the hour. The unprotected groups are affected worst by the consequences of inflation. Curbing the growth of incomes (except those connected with the production of consumer goods and services) will help check inflation in the country which should have a favourable effect on the entire population of the country, Abalkin said.

Reasons for Low Return on Capital Analyzed

PM1210154989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Oct 89 Morning Edition p1

[Yu. Rytov report under the rubric "Statistics and Our Commentary": "Rubles Thrown to the Wind"]

[Text] The USSR State Committee for Statistics has prepared an information report on the utilization of production potential in industry. It notes that industry's fixed production capital at the beginning of 1989 amounted to R883 billion, or approximately half of all fixed production capital in the national economy as a whole. This capital has increased by R118 billion, or 15 percent, in comparison to 1985.

You must agree that this is a colossal increase. More than R100 billion in just 3 years! But what about the return? What kind of growth in output have we managed to achieve? Unfortunately, it is clearly disproportionate to expenditure. There was an average increase in output of 4 percent in the period 1986-1988.... This means that the return on capital fell by 1.2 percent in that period.

This is not the first year we have observed with alarm and concern the process of declining return on capital. In the last 5-year period the drop was even steeper: Minus 3.1 percent. Now, as we can see, it has leveled out a little. But the decline continues nevertheless. This is a sure sign that we have not succeeded in breaking the cost-based nature of our economy.

Why? There are several reasons.

The first reason. It is very obvious: The very heavy legacy we inherited from the era of stagnation. We are using long outdated—physically outdated and obsolete—equipment that is literally destroying the country. At the end of 1988 the proportion of equipment 20 years or more old had reached 11.1 percent.

In order to keep our aging production potential as efficient as possible we have been forced to establish a very powerful repair industry. More than 10 million people are engaged in this industry—that is more than in the whole machine-building complex put together! And, of course, in addition to the labor expenditure, the repair industry swallows up a vast amount of metal and other materials in short supply.

The second reason. Our economy's poor receptivity to scientific and technical progress. A considerable proportion of the new equipment assigned to enterprises in the process of being built or modernized is inferior to the best world models and even the best Soviet models. We have already discussed this in detail in the commentary "Equipment: New, but Not the Best" (no. 238, 1989) and there is no need to repeat ourselves. I would just like to cite another example illustrating this phenomenon. At the beginning of 1989, of 880 production licenses bought abroad and in force, no start had been made on 205 of them. Of these, 185 were still valid but 20 had expired, without production ever having started.

The third reason, which cannot be linked with the period of stagnation by any stretch of the imagination. I am referring to our own lack of organization and poor standard of production, technological, and labor discipline.

For example, a 24-hour survey conducted by statistics bodies in May this year at enterprises in the machine-building complex showed that there had been no positive changes in the use of equipment since a similar study conducted the year before. **The metal-working equipment shift index in basic production was 1.46 on the day the survey was carried out, against 1.48 in 1988.**

A sorry picture! On the day the survey was carried out, 133,300 units of basic production equipment were not working. At one in five enterprises in the machine-building complex, equipment was being used on average for just one shift or even less. The targets set for 1989 for enhancing the equipment shift index had not been met by a single ministry in the complex.

Throughout industry as a whole the level of exploitation of capacity in the current 5-year period has not exceeded 86 percent. As calculations have shown, the national economy loses output worth tens of billions of rubles every year as a result of existing production potential not being used to the full. In particular, in the first 3 years of the 5-year period we were short of more than 500 million items of knitwear, 1.3 million domestic washing machines, 1.4 million refrigerators and deep freezers, approximately 2 million electric vacuum cleaners and television sets, and a multitude of other goods.

We also cannot fail to mention the slow pace at which new production capacities are being assimilated. According to information provided by statistical surveys, two-thirds of all projects which have begun operation in the last 18 months failed to meet the set completion date.

It is a sad fact that they also include enterprises whose output is acutely necessary to the population. Only half of new plants for the production of building bricks,

panels for large-panel housing construction, knitwear, and whole dairy products are actually being used.

Concrete examples? If you like. The Shakshinskiy (Bashkir ASSR) and Novokuznetskiy (Kemerovo Oblast) large-panel housing construction plants, the sewn goods and knitwear factory in Poti, the Akhtyrskiy cheese-making factory (Sumy Oblast), the Nikolayevskiy dairy combine....

If you closely study the draft State Plan for the Economic and Social Development of the Country for the coming year, you cannot fail to see a series of important measures which aim to achieve a general improvement in our work efficiency and, in particular, an increased return on fixed capital. These measures are connected, first, with accelerating scientific and technical progress in all sectors of the national economy. Second, they are concerned with the priority development of machine building and with a new standard of quality in the equipment this sector manufactures.

But this is only one side of the coin. The other, far more important side (as experience has shown) is to ensure that the production collectives themselves have a vested interest in the rational use of means of production and in their renewal and improvement. In this respect we must pin all our hopes on the package of laws to be passed by the USSR Supreme Soviet. The law on ownership, on the socialist enterprise, on lease relations, on taxation, and so forth. We are all well aware that they are now being discussed very carefully and very exactingly. That is understandable, because a fundamental issue on which our future depends is now being decided. That issue is: Whether the labor collective is to be the real owner of the means of production or not.

Economic Experiment Set for Sverdlovsk Oblast

PM1210150789 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 10 Oct 89 Second Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "At the RSFSR Council of Ministers"]

[Text] At a routine session the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Council of Ministers Presidium examined the question of conducting an experiment to try out a mechanism for economic activity on the principles of self-management and self-financing in Sverdlovsk Oblast. The experiment will be carried out in 1990 with a view to boosting the effectiveness of the management of the economic and social sphere in this oblast, stepping up its independence, responsibility, and interest in attaining high end results of economic activity, and preparing for the transition of all oblasts in the Russian Federation to self-management and self-financing in the 13th 5-Year Plan. After detailed discussion of the conditions of the experiment the RSFSR Council of Ministers Presidium on the whole approved the Sverdlovsk Oblast Soviet Executive Committee's proposals concerning new principles of economic activity. It was tasked with putting the finishing touches on a number of proposals in order to present the final version for consideration by the USSR Council of Ministers. It was stressed that broadening Sverdlovsk Oblast's autonomy in resolving questions of accelerating the territory's economic and social development must not violate labor collectives' economic interests and economically accountable rights.

Scientific

Activities of 'Mir' Cosmonauts Updated

Complete 5th Week in Space

LD1110111189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0500 GMT 11 Oct 89

[Text] Aleksandr Viktorenko and Aleksandr Serebrov have completed the fifth week of their spaceflight. Geophysical and astrophysical experiments, routine maintenance on the equipment of the on-board systems, and 2 hours of physical training were included in today's work schedule for the crew of the "Mir" scientific research complex.

The cosmonauts will conduct another series of surveys of various regions of the earth's surface in the environmental study program. Experiments using the telescopes of the international observatory will be continued within the framework of research into extra-atmospheric atronomy.

According to reports from orbit, both cosmonauts are feeling fine.

Correct Flight Trajectory

LD1310103889 Moscow TASS in English 1017 GMT 13 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 13 TASS—By TASS special correspondent:

Medical research and experiments will occupy most of today's work for cosmonauts Aleksandr Viktorenko and Aleksandr Serebrov aboard the research spaceship Mir.

For instance the state of their hearing will be inspected. Plans also provide for experiments to study the dynamics of the changing atmospheric composition at living and working premises and to measure noise from operating systems and equipment at various sections of the orbital complex.

This week they took photographs of various areas of land and the world ocean under the programme for explorations of the earth's natural resources and studies of the environment.

Using the propulsion system of the automatic ferry "Progress M", they carried out a correction of the Mir spaceship's flight trajectory.

The mission proceeds smoothly. The cosmonauts feel well.

Visual Observations, Photos Planned

LD1510020889 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2130 GMT 14 Oct 89

[Text] The crew of the Mir scientific research complex mainly will rest today [15 October]. Only a short series of visual observations and photographs of individual regions of our country are planned. Three working sessions are planned according to the scientific research schedule within the framework of the Roentgen international project. The telescopes of the Kvant module will be pointed toward a flickering X-ray source in the Aquila constellation. This X-ray star is being studied for the first time from the station.

More Tests Planned; Flight Going Well

LD1610082789 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0000 GMT 16 Oct 89

[Text] A routine working week is beginning on board the Mir scientific research complex. Today, Aleksandr Viktorenko, and Aleksandr Serebrov will be occupied primarily with geophysics and space medicine. According to the medical monitoring schedule, the crew will undergo an all-around check of their cardiovascular systems. Within the framework of the extensive program researching the natural resources of the earth and the study of the environment, three photographic sessions of various land and sea regions are planned. According to reports from orbit, the flight is going well, and the cosmonauts feel well.

Safety of Semipalatinsk Test Ground Analyzed

LD1210221289

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1850 GMT on 11 October carries a 50-minute program entitled "Standpoint" and presented by Genrik Borovik. It consists of a hookup between Borovik in Moscow and a group of people in Alma-Ata.

It begins with a video of small Kazakh children and people participating in a demonstration, vast Kazakh landscapes, and street scenes. Borovik briefly summarizes the history of the nuclear test ban moratorium and the way people living next to the testing ground feel about the tests.

O.O. Suleymenov, USSR people's deputy and chairman of the Nevada-Semipalatinsk movement, complains that 20 million hectares of Kazakh lands are being withheld from the people. S.A. Zelentsov, deputy chief of the USSR Defense Ministry Main Directorate, is called upon to reply to this complaint.

Zelentsov says: "I would like to note that at present, you see, we are not only conducting tests. For example, we are holding full-scale talks with the Americans on restrictions and a ban on these tests. I am, for example, the deputy chief of our delegation at the talks in Geneva on this issue." He continues: "I believe that nuclear tests are in actual fact not a blessing, but that they are a necessity. At present it is still a necessity to resolve all the questions connected both with the improvement of nuclear weapons and with the development of methods of defending oneself against the new weapons. They have not lost their pressing nature. For this reason the Semipalatinsk testing ground is continuing tests. The only thing that I would like to note is that in actual fact at present a great deal of anxiety is being caused among the population as to whether the tests are dangerous. We have gone underground. The nuclear explosions are carried out deep below ground and now they are not dangerous. In particular, even in the case of the explosion that was conducted on 12 February and when the release of radioactive products was observed in small quantities, they constituted no danger to the population in the surrounding area."

A monochrome video recording is shown of the Nevada movement demonstration in Alma-Ata on 29 February 1989, and of Suleymenov addressing the rally.

Zelentsov adds: "I would also like to note that at the last explosion on 2 September we invited the public of Karaganda Oblast, Pavlodar Oblast, Eastern Kazakhstan Kray; we invited the public of Semipalatinsk, but there were representatives of the first three oblasts. We took them to the test site, right to the very borehole. During the explosion they were 3.8 km from that borehold. They watched how after the explosion the staff of the testing ground went to work, how they sealed off possible channels through which the products may leak. A certain increase in the background radiation was found around the borehole, but that caused no trouble because the increase was short-lived, lasting approximately 10 minutes. Then these products were localized. At the borehole there was a small escape of gases from the nuclear explosion as well. We won't conceal that, but this gas went nowhere beyond the area immediately around the borehole. There is certainly no reason for saying that it constitutes some kind of danger to the population beyond the bounds of the testing ground. That gas did not escape beyond the bounds of the testing ground."

Borovik asks why a detailed report on this explosion and the escape of gases was not published to let the public learn about the actual situation. More video footage of demonstrations is featured. M.M. Auezov, another member of the Nevada-Semipalatinsk movement, asks why the indigenous peoples of the area were not warned about the 2 September explosion. This is followed by a recording of Yazov speaking at the USSR Supreme Soviet first session in Moscow on 3 July 1989.

Kazakh TV presenter G.Kh. Yergaliyeva asks why the test was carried out on 2 September during peace week and recounts how schoolchildren in the villages near the testing ground tried to prevent military helicopters from landing. Zelentsov says: "The local party and local soviet bodies were told of the coming explosion a few days

beforehand. Representatives of the Kazakh Academy of Sciences from Alma-Ata were present to see whether any kind of vibrations would be felt there. There were two representatives accompanied by an officer from the testing ground. They did indeed fly in on helicopters. They told people how and when the explosion would be conducted. They explained that the explosion would not only not be felt on the surface and would not have any impact on them, but this would be confirmed by the instruments that the representatives from Alma-Ata, the Kazakh representatives, would use to take measurements." Video shows the testing ground during an explosion, and fluid in glasses rising and falling with the impact.

I.Ya. Chastinov from the Kazakh Academy of Sciences Institute of High Energy Physics, says that Zelentsov "will probably not deny that in the period 1949-63 the population living in the area around the testing ground received a definite dose, a considerable dose moreover." In this connection, he asks why the energy yield of the explosions cannot be scaled down.

Zelentsov replies: "As regards a limitation on the energy yield, you see the talks are targeted at that. At the moment the question being dealt with with the Americans is that of restricting the energy yield of the explosions that are conducted in the Soviet Union to 150 kilotonnes. As regards the limits to which the tests should be restricted in our country, let us decide that with the Americans. We will resolve that question."

Radiologist A.F. Tsyb, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Medical Radiology, says that he has spent the last 3 months working in Semipalatinsk, heading a commission consisting of doctors and scientists studying the ecological situation and the people's state of health. He says that the seismic factor is one of the major negative elements in conducting the explosions. Specifically, in the area immediately adjacent to the testing ground, the seismic wave is as much as 4 points and in the town of Semipalatinsk it reaches 2 points. Natural seismic activity in the area is approximately 5 points, but these regular monthly seismic waves are affecting people's health and causing great incidence of nervous disorders. He therefore recommends that the number of explosions per year and their energy yield should be reduced. This Health Ministry Institute of Biophysics, says that no single factor affecting people's health has been discerned and that "the general state of health of the residents of Semipalatinsk, say, is no worse and unfortunately no better that in other regions of our country. It causes anxiety just as in other regions. It turned out that the correlation dependence had an approximate coefficient of 098. As release of sulfurous anhydride increase, the incidence of malignant tumors rises. "This is countered by a local resident who has lived there for 30 years and who claims that the incidence of illness does not appear to be any greater.

B.I. Gusev, chief doctor at the 4th clinic of the USSR Health Ministry in Semipalatinsk, adds: "The incidence of cancer has been monitored for 27-30 years. What have we learned? Approximately 7,000 people figured in these data. These were people from (Sarazhalo), (Korinara), Karaul, (Dolonin), Mostik, Cheremushki, (Konomerka). The following was revealed: In individuals in the main group, that is who had been exposed to radiation throughout the entire period of 27 years, incidence of oncological diseases was 40 percent more frequent than in the control groups. What is more, in the main all the cases of oncological disease were discovered by disorders of the gastro-intestinal tract. These were stomach, oesophagus and liver tumors. Tumors of the oesophagus attracted particular attention and were regarded as suspicious. You know that tumors of the oesophagus.... [He changes thought] Here in Semipalatinsk that is a kray pathology. But what happened here throughout that time has naturally crossed out all the possible and permissible understandings of what might occur. We believe that an enormous role in these tumors is played by the potentiating of the carcenogenic effects. We have received more of them—let's say, in these regions (?it was) four or five times more than the national norm. Here we have received seven or eight times more of them."

Suleymenov complains that unlike the residents of Hiroshima, who now live long lives owing to good health care for residents of the rural localities, specifically around Kurchatov, live in primitive conditions without a proper water supply and do not undergo twice-yearly medical checks. Video shows village conditions with people fetching water from a well.

M.B. Zhangelova, doctor of medicine and chairman of the Semipalatinsk Peace Committee, complains that nowhere else in the world have people been subjected to continuous nuclear testing for 14 years and that all the open letters and appeals to the government have met with silence. She states that people in the area have reduced immunity to all diseases, particularly blood diseases.

M.E. Kulmanov, general director of the republican health care center, replies to calls for figures: "Let us take for example malignant formations. Figures for 10 years available for the republic, for the period from 1976-87 are 163 cases per 100,000 of the population, while in eastern Kazakhstan they are 226, in Karanganda Oblast 174, in Semipalatinsk Oblast I have mentioned 167. Among the child population for iron deficiency anaemia there are republican figures of 226.9, for Semipalatinsk 239, almost 240. In eastern Kazakhstan the figure is 264, in Karanganda Oblast 315."

There follows a video interview with an elderly Kazakh man who recounts that on 3 August 1953 he and his fellow villagers were evacuated 90 km from their village and they stayed away for 1 month. When they returned he found his dog, which he had been unable to find during the evacuation. The dog was completely bald and died 1 month later. He says that they are evacuated every time before an explosion, but they have never seen their housing being decontaminated. Although the tests are

held underground, the old man says that during haymaking they find hares lying on the steppe alive but unable to run away from the hay cutter. He tells of two deaths in the family from cancer and a grandchild born paralyzed.

There is a brief discussion in which it is stated that electromagnetic radiation has no effect, and at present there are no data for infrasonic effects.

Asked the possibility of an ecological catastrophe caused by damage to the rock formations, Zelentsov replies: "I believe that scientists should have the say here. Scientists are studying this issue, and at least according to available data there are no grounds here of concern to miners who are tunneling, cutting galleries and sinking boreholes. Such issues have not arisen in our country."

Video shows open landscapes, people wearing masks, and an interview in a tent with A.D. Ilenko, head of the Semipalatinsk testing ground, who expresses the opinion that from a political viewpoint it would be quite wrong to move the testing ground elsewhere, since this is counter to the present test ban talks. He states that the cost of a new testing ground would be R 4-5 billion.

M. Yeleusizov, a lawyer, asks why the testing ground is not being moved to Novaya Zemlya, and why the Soviet Union has to have two testing grounds.

V.N. Mikhaylov, deputy minister of atomic power and industry states that he has spent approximately 30 years at the testing ground, that the tests have been reduced by 1.5-2 times compared with those planned, and that the energy yield has been reduced. He expresses the opinion that the 13th Five-Year-Plan will be a breakthrough after which one testing ground will remain, which he believes will be Novaya Zemlya.

Video shows an army officer resident in Kurchatov and a civilian resident who say how healthy they all are and how they are not afraid of radiation. This is followed by video scenes of demonstrations on 6 August 1989 in the village of Karaul in Semipalatinsk Oblast, where residents are heaping up stones. Video footage is then shown of the U.S. testing ground in Nevada, followed by pictures of a "Nevada" movement demonstration.

Suleymenov says that, according to demographers, in the area adjacent to the testing ground there is zero population growth and that in (Babayevsk) the population growth is 22 times lower than the average for the republic.

Borovik says that the Alma-Ata-Moscow hookup was filmed 2 weeks ago. He states that the Soviet Union carried out 16 explosions last year, 5 explosions this year, and claimed that the United States carried out 2 explosions that were kept secret, but the USSR knows about them.

He concludes that the secrecy surrounding the Semipalatinsk testing ground over the last 40 years was evidently to stop Soviet people from learning about it, and that the Soviet system was to blame for this secrecy. "Unfortunately the Defense Ministry does not give us the opportunity to compare the calculations of scientists and the calculations of the ministry because these data are still classified for the moment."

Borovik ends the program with a summary of the disarmament developments and movement at the present.

Dangers of Tatar AES Construction Explained

LD1210171289

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1230 GMT on 12 October broadcasts a 30-minute news program from the Tatar Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic (ASSR) which includes a report on the growing opposition to the construction of a nuclear power station in the republic.

The presenter notes that the site of the new station geologically resembles that of the Chernobyl Nuclear Electronic Power Station (AES). He interviews Professor (Kopeykin), a geologist who has been studying the migration of radionuclides into the subsoil waters at Chernobyl. He says: "The Chernobyl station is situated on a fault. Our Tatar AES is unfortunately similarly situated. This is a fault about which a great deal has already been written in our local press." He says that his institute has submitted its findings at the request of the Tatar ASSR State Planning Committee, although these findings have not yet been published in full. Explaining the background to the present situation he says that originally there were 26 other possible sites for the station which were rejected for various reasons. The Ministry of Atomic Power, he says, conducted their own geoligical surveys, and ignored the views of the Tatar ASSR geologists, in spite of their sizeable experience in selecting sites for building various facilities. He explains that geological surveys are not carried out by the Ministry of Geology, by professionals, but by the geological service of the Ministry of Atomic Power, which works according to its instructions, and often fail to take sufficient care in their work. "It was the first time I had come across such geological material. We were just flabbergasted. Gaps all over the place, and discrepancies, all of this was the material of the Ministry of Atomic Power." Among the defects he points out is that the cooling pond will be in the region of a floodplain—just as in the case of Chernobyl, it was on the Pripyat River, here it is the Kama River; also, the lack of reliable insulation and drainage into the Kama is a problem. The findings of his institute, states the professor, state clearly that the geological position does not allow the construction of a nuclear power station. "We were examining solely the geological setting of the station, and it has turned out to be defective. One cannot build there."

The presenter then interviews a writer from the Bashkir ASSR who outlines the opposition among the public of his republic to the construction of a similar nuclear power station there. Reading from an appeal, he says: "The probability of an accident at the AES is increased

by the unfortunate choice of the site, and this is why. A swampy site has been chosen. The first water-bearing horizon lies at a depth of from 0-12 meters. The movement of these waters is in the direction of the Belaya River, where radioactive sediment will end up. The station is being built on sand, clay, and quicksand.... Alongside the building site of the AES there are faults. The seismicity of the site is assessed at 5-7 points. Will the Bashkir AES, located on such weak soils, stand up to a possible blow from the underground elements? For a reactor to be put out of action, an incline of just 1 degree is sufficient."

The presenter points out the similarity between the Tatar and Bashkir AES construction projects, noting in particular the recent earthquakes at Almetyevsk and Yelabuga. She concludes: "On 6 October a provisional republican public committee was set up in the Tatar ASSR to stop the construction of the Tatar AES. It is headed by Konovalov, USSR people's deputy and rector of the Kazan State University.

Ukraine Research Adds to Galaxy Knowledge

LD1510114989 Moscow TASS in English 1126 GMT 15 Oct 89

[Text] Kharkov October 15 TASS—By TASS correspondent Mark Khabinskiy:

Scientists of the radio astronomical institute of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences added new important details to the "portrait" of our galaxy, namely the structure of its magnetic field and directions of the field lines. This extremely valuable information was obtained on the world's largest long-wave radio telescope, in operation near Kharkov.

"The space signals, registered by unique instruments, have additional convincing evidence which proved the correctness of current scientific views and enriched radio astronomy with new experimental data," says the institute director, Leonid Litvinenko.

"It has been confirmed that the 'mainstay' of our galaxy, which consists of 200 billion stars, has the shape of spiral. It is sort of twisted into five giant coils. The earth and the entire solar system are located on the end of the third coil. Magnetic fields and roughly ten times weaker between the coils of the spiral and have less stars. We managed to measure the tension of the magnetic field in this highly rarefied space. Field lines play a very important role because they serve as the supporting structure, on which the clouds of space gas rest. The research of Soviet scientists helped determine more clearly the "tracery" of nebulae between the coils of the spiral."

With the help of latest technical means, the Soviet scientists for the first time measures the temperature of highly rarefied space nebulae, which are located at a distance of many thousands of light years from the earth. However, there are still mystery areas which remain closed to observation, the scientist continued. These is vast space between neighbouring galaxies, where the density of rarefied space matter is hundreds and even thousands times lower.

Military

Bomber, Transport Collide in Caucasus; Six Killed

PM1510170189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 1

[R. Ignatyev report: "Crash on Takeoff"]

[Text] An SU-24 bomber crashed while taking off on a routine mission during the night of 12 October 1989. There was loss of life. IZVESTIYA's correspondent asked Lieutenant General Ye. Shaposhnikov, first deputy commander of the Air Force, for details of the accident.

It happened at an airstrip in the Caucasus. At the moment of takeoff, the SU-24 bomber piloted by two airmen ran into an AN-12 transport aircraft parked on the tarmac. The crash happened at high speed. The SU-24 had not yet managed to take off.

Anticipating the danger, the bomber's navigator managed to eject literally in the last few seconds. The captain did not manage to abandon the aircraft in time. He died....

A USSR Defense Ministry commission headed by Lieutenant General of Aviation Ye. Rusanov has started investigating the causes of the disaster. It is still too early to talk about the results. It is known, however, that the transport aircraft was parked and being refueled at the time of the crash. A crew of four men and an officer from the airstrip battalion's fuel and lubrication service were working around it. The collision caused a powerful explosion and a fire broke out, since both the SU-24 and the AN-12 had full tanks.

...Emergency services, firefighting subunits, and ambulances made their way to the site of the incident. Both aircraft were already on fire. A second explosion could have occurred at any moment, since a fuel tanker was nearby. Risking their lives, people drove a truck to the site, took the gasoline tanker in tow, and pulled it away from the raging fire.

Several other transport aircraft were parked next to the burning aircraft. They were also towed to safety in time. The airmen and the officer from the battalion's fuel and lubrication service could not be saved; they died instantly in the explosion. In all, six men lost their lives. Both aircraft were totally burned out....

Our special photo correspondent Andrey Chepakin happened to be at the airstrip at the time and witnessed the crash.

The commission will draw conclusions on the causes of the accident.

Moiseyev Cites Importance of Naval Dialogue

LD1410125389 Moscow TASS in English 1231 GMT 14 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 14 TASS—"To seek ways to avoid confrontation at sea is in the interests of both the Soviet Union and the U.S.

Continuing along the path which both sides have pursued will lead to a catastrophe," said Army General Mikhail Moiseyev, chief of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces. He spoke in a TASS interview today at the end of the official visit to the Soviet Union by Admiral Carlisle A.H. Trost, chief of Naval Operations.

Moiseyev said the Soviet military leadership has been generally satisfied with Soviet-U.S. relationship in the military field. However, some views, expressed by the Americans, "caused bewilderment, especially with regard to limiting naval activity."

Naval forces are becoming increasingly offensive in nature, therefore this major component of the military power of states and alliances should be included in the active negotiating process. By excluding naval forces from talks on disarmament, the American side tries to secure unilateral advantages in the military field, the general continued.

"As progress will be made in other fields of disarmament," he noted, "the share of the Navy in the total balance of forces and their destabilising nature will objectively increase."

Moiseyev said dialogue should start with the discussion of openness in the world ocean. Such openness could envisage implementation of the proposals earlier made by the Soviet side. These include extending confidence building measures to the activity of the Navy, exchanging information on the fleets' potentials, notifying about major naval exercises, making it easier for naval vessels of other states to call at ports used as a base by fleet, and some other proposals.

"Such measures of confidence building and openness will help lessen the danger of armed conflicts stemming from errors in evaluating naval activity," Moiseyev said.

Government Announces Carrier Rocket Test Launches

LD1310130889 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1229 GMT 13 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow, 13 Oct (TASS)—Carrier rocket launches will be carried out in the Soviet Union from 17-26 October into areas of the Pacific Ocean, limited within a radius of 30 nautical miles each from the centers of coordinates 22 degress 35 minutes north, 174 degrees 10 minutes east and 17 degrees 10 minutes north and 175 degrees 15 minutes east.

TASS is authorized to state that in order to guarantee safety, the Government of the USSR asks the governments of other states using maritime and air routes in the Pacific Ocean to instruct the relevant bodies to order maritime and air vessels not to enter these areas or the air space over them daily from 1300 to 1900 local times.

Food Production for Soviet Army Discussed

90UM0024A Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 40 7-13 Oct 89 pp 2-3

[Report on interview with Major General V. Shenin, chief of an unidentified USSR Ministry of Defense directorate, by V. Solovyev and D. Pushkar: "Who Feeds the Army;" date and occasion not specified]

[txt] The new military doctrine adopted by the country will make it possible in the near future to reduce expenditures on the upkeep of the Army substantially. Nevertheless, their share in the overall budget remains high, which, naturally, does not contribute to a speedy resolution of the tasks facing the country. Therefore, special interest is aroused today by innovative proposals and new forms of work that lessen the burden of military expenditures. Our interlocutor, Major General V. Shenin, believes that the self-provisioning of the army with agricultural products is of no small importance in resolving the food problem.

[Solovyev, Pushkar] Vitaliy Semenovich, the directorate of the Ministry of Defense which you head is hardly a particularly secret subdivision. However, we know almost nothing about its activity.

[Shenin] Ensuring the combat readiness of the Army concerns not only the production of military equipment, combat training, or the development of military science. There is also such a prosaic matter as the qualitative nourishment of servicemen. We all know with what difficulty the food problem is being resolved in our country, and, in order not to be a "parasite" on the country, the Soviet Army has been engaged in the production of agricultural products for its own use for a long time.

The Ministry of Defense now has thousands of subsidiary farms under its jurisdiction, more than 80 military sovkhozes [state farms] and 80 special dairies.

[Solovyev, Pushkar] What is the economic efficiency of your farms like?

[Shenin] We gather 20.5 quintals of grain from 1 hectare and 140 quintals of potatoes from 1 hectare. The average milk yield for one fodder-fed cow is 3,550 liters a year, and the egg-laying ability of one laying hen is 210-260 eggs a year.

[Solovyev, Pushkar] It can be surmised that the prime cost of your products is significantly lower than that in the ordinary kolkhozes [collective farms] and sovkhozes, for the soldier does not get a wage....

[Shenin] The prime cost of our products is indeed somewhat lower, but not because soldiers are a cheap labor force. As a rule, only the chief is military in our sovkhozes, and the civilian population works according to norms approved for a given rayon. The difference is only that the total production goes to the support of the Soviet Army.

[Solovyev, Pushkar] In that case, it turns out that again it is not the Army that supplies itself, but that rural workers feed it?

[Shenin] To demonstrate clearly how a military sovkhoz operates, let us look into one of them in greater detail—the former kolkhoz "Zarya Kommunizma" ["Dawn of Communism"] of the Lyubimskiy Rayon of Yaroslavl Oblast. We took it on our Ministry of Defense books in February of this year. The rayon center Lyubim is separated from the central farmstead by such a lack of roads that it was even difficult for the tractors to get there through the mud. The young people, of course, had left, and there was no one to do the work. We found dilapidated farms and rusting equipment. The fodder was practically gone in the kolkhoz by February, and the cows were literally lying down and without the strength to get up.

A construction detachment that at one time participated in the construction of missile launchers is working here now—it is now engaged in the construction of farms and housing. One subunit is building the Lyubim-Pokrov road, and another is erecting a livestock production facility. After accepting the kolkhoz, the Ministry of Defense paid off a R3.5 million debt, and another R1 million to cancel the interest for loans not paid on time.

[Solovyev, Pushkar] What future do you see for this kolkhoz? Who will live and work here when the military leave?

[Shenin] In the next 2-3 years, we plan to invest R30-35 million and to set up the kind of living conditions here for rural workers that will also attract young people and first class specialists. Our subunits have already started to implement the general plan for the development of the sovkhoz, which envisages the construction of 1-story cottages for a single family, according to the best projects that have been developed for Nechernozemye [Non-Black Earth Zone]. We will build a kindergarten on the central farmstead, an aid station, a school, and a sports facility with a swimming pool, and we will put in central heating and a sewer system. Briefly, we will furnish the residents all city conveniences.

It is certain that we will have to call on military subunits to work in the sovkhoz in the future, and conditions here will be sufficiently attractive for rural workers.

[Solovyev, Pushkar] We had occasion to hear from some of the officers who are on temporary assignment here that the use of military subunits in the construction of cow sheds, for example, discredits the army.

[Shenin] Of course, the primary mission of the Soviet Army is the defense of the state, but soldiers have always come to the aid of the civilian population in various emergency situations. I believe that it is our sacred duty to help the country resolve a most difficult problem—the food problem. The prestige of the army can only grow from this.

[Solovyev, Pushkar] Do you think that work in this kind of sovkhoz can become an alternative to military service in the future?

[Shenin] Under conditions of a reduction in the numerical strength of personnel of the armed forces, I think that a part of the youth, especially rural youth, could become fully involved in the resolution of labor-intensive tasks that face the country, including involvement in work in village as well.

[Solovyev, Pushkar] Vitaliy Semenovich, the kolkhoz "Zarya Kommunizma" that was transferred to the Ministry of Defense supplied the civilian population with agricultural products, in particular the Yaroslavl Oblast. Now all of its production goes to the Army. Will this not have an effect on the supply of food for residents of the oblast?

[Shenin] It will have an effect. While previously Yaroslavl Oblast turned over part of its, as it is, not very rich funds to military units deployed on its territory, the funds will now be put at the disposal of local authorities.